DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 190 FL 012 202

AUTHOR Chun, Judith, Ed.
TITLE Second Language Acquisition Notes & Topics, Volume X, Number 2.
INSTITUTION San Francisco State Univ., Calif.
PUB DATE Dec 80
NOTE 94p.
JOURNAL CIT Second Language Acquisition Notes & Topics; v10 n2 Dec 1980

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Indochinese; Language Research; Refugees; *Second Language Learning; *Social Science Research; *Sociolinguistics
IDENTIFIERS *United States (Southwest)

ABSTRACT

This issue contains two feature items. The "SLANT Special Report on Current Research with Indochinese Refugees in the U.S." describes 14 research projects in progress. The article "Southwestern Applied Linguistics" by John W. Oller, Jr. and others presents an overview of sociolinguistic research in the southwestern United States as it has been reported by presenters at recent conferences. The newsletter concludes with reports from several conferences and a variety of announcements focusing on research in progress and upcoming conferences. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Second Language Acquisition Notes & Topics

A NEWSLETTER FOR RESEARCHERS AND TEACHERS VOLUME X, NUMBER 2 DEC., 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY J. Chun, Ed.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MANAGING EDITOR: Judith Chun
ASSISTANT EDITOR: Karen O'Neill
BUSINESS MANAGER: Don Kissinger
PRODUCTION MANAGER: Tamara Lucas

ED201190

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SLANT SPECIAL REPORT ON CURRENT RESEARCH WITH INDOCHINESE REFUGEES IN THE U.S.	1
SOUTHWESTERN APPLIED LINGUISTICS Guest Editors: John W. Oller, Jr., Stephen W. Rose, Judith L. Brown, and Nancy Morales	12
CONFERENCE REPORTS	65
Language Attrition Conference by Barbara Freed and Richard Lambert	65
RELC Regional Seminar by Teodoro A. Llamzon	70
The Colchester Second Language Acquisition Workshop by Vivian Cook	74
JALT Conference by Yoshiko Takahashi	75
Symposium on Linguistic Problems of Minority Groups and The Sociology of Literature by Guus Extra	77
Boston University Conference on Language Development	78
UPCOMING CONFERENCES	80
TESOL Annual Conference	80
IXth Conference on Applied Linguistics	80
CATESOL	80
RELC Regional Seminar	80
Symposium on Research in Child Language Disorders	81
Institute for Haitian Creole Bilingual Teachers	81
SCLRF	82
ANNOUNCEMENTS	82
Courses and Programs	82
Publications	84
PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED	85
RESUMES OF RESEARCH IN PROGRESS	86
SUBSCRIPTION POLICY & RENEWAL INFORMATION	89

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FL012 202

Copyright © 1980 by SLANT Newsletter, English Department, San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA 94132 USA

SLANT SPECIAL REPORT ON CURRENT RESEARCH WITH INDOCHINESE REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES

The recent influx of refugees from Southeast Asia to the United States represents a large and distinctive group of second language learners. This group of refugees also represents a population of interest to second language teachers and researchers. During the summer of 1980, a survey was conducted by SLANT in order to collect and share information on current research involving Indochinese refugees. The information which follows is the result of questionnaires distributed by SLANT to participants in ESL, bilingual, and cross-cultural conferences, to academic institutions, and to organizations and individuals involved with special projects for the Office of Refugee Affairs.

The responses received indicate that materials development rather than pure research is the primary focus of current work with the Indochinese population. The relevant issues in much of what is being done are cultural and social rather than pedagogical. The great majority of the responses to the questionnaire were acknowledgments of the desire and need to find out what is happening in this field. Few of the respondents were involved in research with the Indochinese population, but all were interested in hearing from researchers in this field.

The following abstracts of current research certainly do not represent all research in this area, but perhaps present a starting point to those interested in learning more about research in this field. Although the questionnaire focused on North America, two responses which were returned from Australia are also listed. Responses to the questionnaire also referred to related research with Indochinese populations in Western Europe. One response from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) is also included in the abstracts which follow. (Another Canadian source for researchers in the field of immigrant language acquisitions and social adjustment is the Ontario Ministry of Culture and Recreation.)

Unless otherwise noted, the primary sponsor of the research is the researcher's institution as given in the address.

The following abstracts were received in response to the question: Are you currently conducting research on language involving Indochinese groups and language?

- "The Cultural Context of Cognitive Growth: A Development Ethology of Vietnamese Children in the Second Year of Life" R.L. Gellerman, Department of Psychology and Social Relations, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138.

A longitudinal study of the maturationally-based changes in cognitive competencies during the second year of life is proposed here, to assess the course of development in a sample of Vietnamese infants in the Boston area.

In comparison with neonates and children of 1 to 12 months of age, the cognitive changes concomitant with the development of symbolic capacities in the second year have received relatively little attention. The research will address the following questions: What is the developmental progression for memory linguistic inference, language comprehension and production among Vietnamese children from 16 to 28 months of ago? What does the growth curve of such cognitive functions look like and how does it compare with that of American infants?

By the middle of the second year, social and emotional changes in children's behavior and expression suggest the emergence of self-awareness. A further aim of this research is to study the development of feelings of pride, self-efficacy and distress in problem-solving situations and imitation in play.

Some psychologists have suggested that development of cognitive capacities in infancy should be relatively impervious to all but extremely deviant environmental conditions, i.e., not sensitive to cultural variations in the individual experience. Accordingly, the prediction is that cognitive growth among a sample of healthy immigrant Vietnamese children should proceed in parallel to the course of development of similar capacities obtaining among American children, if cognitive development is not predicated upon sociocultural factors in the second year of life.

- "A Study of the Relationships Between First Language Proficiency and the Development of Second Language Proficiency in Japanese and Vietnamese Immigrant Students" J. Cummins and M. Swain, Ontario Institute of Studies in Education, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M55 1V6.

This study is designed to investigate a theory of language proficiency and its cross-lingual dimensions. It is based on the following two hypotheses: (1) a dimension of cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP) can be empirically distinguished from interpersonal communicative skills in both first (L1) and second (L2) languages; and (2) cognitive/academic language proficiencies in both L1 and L2 are interdependent, i.e., they are manifestations of the same underlying dimension.

The hypotheses give rise to a prediction regarding the questions of age and second language acquisition. Specifically, because the same dimension underlies CALP in both L1 and L2, older learners will manifest CALP more rapidly in L2 than younger learners. However, no advantage is predicted for older learners in the acquisition of L2 interpersonal communicative skills.

Two studies will be carried out to investigate these hypotheses. The studies will involve approximately sixty-four Japanese immigrant students and sixty Cantonese-speaking Vietnamese refugee students in Toronto, Canada. Measures of L1 CALP and interpersonal communicative skills will be administered to two different age groups within each immigrant language group and related to the development of English CALP and interpersonal communicative skills.

- "The Role of French-English (misleading) Cognates and Formal Contrasts in the Recognition and Production of the English Lexicon by Vietnamese Subjects" J.K. Ulijn, Eindhoven University of Technology, Department of Applied Linguistics, P.O. Box 513, 5600 MB Eindhoven, The Netherlands; A. Donn and S. Wolfe, San Francisco State University, 1600 Holloway, San Francisco, CA 94132; P.H. Nguyen, San Francisco Community College, 800 Mission, San Francisco, CA 94103.

This research investigates the role of a second language lexicon (L2, in this case French) in the recognition and production of a third language lexicon (L3, English) where the first language (L1, Vietnamese) has no apparent influence on the learning of L2 and L3. Contrasts between French and English are varied in terms of conceptual structure and linguistic form. Recognition is tested by translating designated English words (in isolated Vietnamese sentences) into French and Vietnamese. Production is tested by similarly translating Vietnamese words into French and English.

Subjects are an experimental group (EG) of Vietnamese adults with a good working knowledge of French and a poor knowledge of English, and a control group (CG) with a poor knowledge of both languages. Similarities and differences between French and English are predicted by using lexical contrasts of cognates, misleading cognates and formal contrasts. For the EG, cognates should be easier than formal contrasts, and the formal contrasts should be easier than misleading cognates. For the CG, there should be no difference. Possible data analysis techniques are: analysis of variance, chi-square tests and rank correlation coefficients. Results will be relevant for the study of lexical acquisition in L2 or L3 given knowledge of L1 and/or L2.

This project receives support from the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research through a fellowship to the principal investigator who is visiting during 1979-1980 at the School of Education and the Department of Linguistics of Stanford University, and who is normally affiliated with the Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands.

- "Cambodian/English Contrastive Materials", G. Thurgood, Department of Linguistics, California State University Fresno, CA 93740

The project is three-fold. First, a survey is being made of the existing Cambodian/English contrastive materials. Second, once the survey is completed, it should be clear what additional contrastive work needs to be done. Third, teaching materials will be prepared to fill the gaps revealed by the survey and the contrastive analysis.

- "Pronouns and Kinship Terms in Tai Dam, Lao, and other Tai Languages", D. Strecker, Department of Linguistics, 1976 Frieze Building, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Languages of the Tai language family have a large number of first, second, and third person pronouns. The choice of pronoun depends on the social status of the speaker, addressee, and/or referent and on the interpersonal relationships among them. There is great variation from one individual to another with regard to what pronouns are used in what social situations. In order to account for this variation I propose that the meanings of pronouns in Tai languages should not be described in absolute terms, but rather should be described relative to the meanings of other pronouns.

Tai languages make much use of kinship terms as first, second, and third person pronouns so I am also studying both the structure of the kinship system of each language and the ways in which the kinship terms are used as pronouns.

Available findings:

"Absolute vs. Relative Meaning: The Case of the Tai Pronouns". To appear in Proceedings of the 1979 Mid-America Linguistics Conference, University of Nebraska, 1980.

"Hierarchies of Closeness and Respect in Thai Pronoun Usage". Paper distributed at the 13th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, October 24-26, 1980, Charlottesville, Virginia.

System and Variation in Southwestern Tai Pronoun Usage, PHd dissertation, University of Michigan, expected date of completion late 1980 or early 1981.

- "Grammar, Lexicon and Ethnolinguistics of White Hmong," D. Strecker Department of Linguistics, 1976 Frieze Building, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109.

I am currently working on a collection of texts with interlinear word-for-word and free translations accompanied by a Hmong-English and English-Hmong vocabulary keyed to the texts. One of the texts is a set of Hmong-English language lessons designed to teach simple everyday conversation to English speakers wishing to learn Hmong. The other texts are taken from published books and periodicals written by Hmong writers for Hmong readers. The collection of texts may also include a grammatical sketch of Hmong and ethnographic and linguistic notes on passages in the texts likely to be puzzling to English-speaking readers.

I have also just begun work on an English-to-White Hmong dictionary designed primarily for Hmong speakers learning English but also keeping in mind the needs of English speakers learning Hmong. Both the dictionary and the chrestomathy will be co-authored with Mim Yaj.

Available Findings: Nothing is available yet. I hope to have a preliminary version of the dictionary ready for circulation by early 1981.

- "Survey of ESL Programs for Indochinese Refugees," J.J. Bauman, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1611 N. Kent Street, Arlington, VA 22209

The study will focus on the following points:

— English language needs as seen by refugees, sponsors and voluntary agencies;
— what is now being done to answer these needs in selected case study sites in the U.S., and whether these activities do indeed answer the needs;
— the resources available, both nationally, and in the case study areas;
— the priority steps which must be taken for programs to more effectively respond to the needs.

The case study sites will be varied both in geographic location and in type, and will be selected so as to have implications for similar locations and types. We expect the recommendations of the study to be useful to volags, foundations, government agencies and the grass roots programs themselves. Although a prospective Education Resource Center in

Bangkok was not contemplated when discussions of this survey began, we expect the results of the study to have considerable impact on the planning for ESL work in Southeast Asia.

- "A Simplified Beginning ESL Program Using Reading, Writing, and Peer Instruction"; E.M. Swengel, San Diego Community College, Adult and Continuing Education, Literacy Project, 5350 University Avenue, San Diego, CA 92105.

  As this is primarily a curriculum development project, rigorous experimental methods are not being used. Student performance data (reading, pronouncing, identifying meanings) from an experimental class (N=25) will be compared, using simple statistical analysis, with data from similar students in regular beginning ESL classes which do not stress literacy and pronouncing to the extent they are practical in the experimental class.

  Subjects are mainly recently-arrived Indochinese refugees (Vietnamese, Laotian, Lao-Hmong, and Cambodian) and Mexican immigrants with little or no schooling in their native language, and minimal understanding of English.

  The program consists of simultaneous instruction in both written and spoken English: students learn to pronounce English words understandably from phonetic transcription — laugh/laf/—using a list of 2,000 functional words translated into Cambodian, Chinese, Hmong, Japanese, Laotian, Persian, Filipino (Tagalog), Spanish, and Vietnamese, along with a translated introduction to the English phonetic system and its relation to each of these nine languages. A phonics approach to spelling and pronunciation is used to develop competence in both reading and speaking. A-V aids are used — the Language Master for individual words and tape recorders for sentences — to help develop oral-aural skills simultaneously with literacy skills. Group presentations are supplemented by one-on-one and small group activities.

  This project was funded by USOE—Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) and will continue for three years if funded again. The subject of the continuing research will be a developmental program for adult ESL students, from illiteracy to functional competence in both oral and written English.

- "Vietnamese Refugees in America: Toward a Theory of Spontaneous International Migration," D. Montero, School of Social Work, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85281

This article describing the spontaneous migration pattern of the Vietnamese refugees compared to the more traditional immigration pattern of other Asians in the United States was published in the "International Migration Review," Vol. Xiii, No. 4, Winter 1979, pp 624-648. Montero has also written Vietnamese Americans; Patterns of Resettlement and Socioeconomic Adaption in the United States (Westview Press. 1980)

- "The Development of Occupational Identity Among Vietnamese Refugees," C.R. Finnan, SRI International, 333 Ravenswood, Menlo Park, CA 94025

The paper is based on an ethnographic study of adult Vietnamese refugees engaged in job training. Students were entrolled in a six-month program to become certified electronics technicians. The quality of the training during the first three months is best described as chaotic. Little learning occurred and many students dropped out. Most of the Vietnamese students, however, retained their excitment about eventually taking jobs as technicians. Influences outside of training appeared to nurture their interest.

I concluded that the Vietnamese community was responsible for instilling and fostering interest in electronics technician jobs. How does this occur? First, the community supplies role models of people employed in the industry for other members looking for a new occupation. Second, the community helps members mold an image of themselves consistent with the demands of the job, while shaping an image of the job consistent with their image of themselves. The Vietnamese community is so closely involved in this process that it is difficult to determine whether refugees become technicians because "it is a good job for me," or because "it is a good job for us Vietnamese."

The paper presents a new approach to understanding occupational identity development. Emphasis is shifted beyond fitting an individual to a job and beyond formal training to emphasize the influence of the wider social context. Student's success or failure in job training and their ultimate satisfaction on the job depends largely on their community's support for the job. High quality training is still important, but all trainers must be aware of powerful influences on learning which exist in the students' social environment.

- "Progress of Language Acquisition vs Employability," E. Silverman, Government Center for Asian Assistance, 160 N. La Salle, Room 2006, Chicago, IL 60601.

No abstract was available for this on-going study of language learning of adult Indochinese immigrants.

In response to the question: Are you planning to conduct research on language learning involving Indochinese groups and languages?, the following (untitled) abstract was received:

- D. Thrift, and K. Kong-on Kim, National Center for Bilingual Research, 4665 Lampson Avenue, Los Alamitos, CA 90720.

The National Center for Bilingual Research was established in November of 1979 to conduct primary research on language and education in bilingual settings. The Center, sponsored by the National Institute of Education, is funded at approximately one million dollars a year for five years and anticipates working with three broadly defined populations: Asian, Hispanic and Native American. Details of a comprehensive research plan are being finalized pending appointment of a permanent directorate for the Center. It is anticipated that the workplan will be more fully developed by this summer. Please feel free to contact us then for up-dated information.

In addition to the responses on research in North America, two questionnaires were returned from Australia.

- "Structural Development in the English of Vietnamese Children in the Primary School," I.W. Fry, State College of Victoria at Coburg, Box 179 Coburg, 3058, Victoria, Australia.

The subjects are all Vietnamese refugee children who have recently arrived in Melbourne. Most of the first phase learners are in language reception centers especially established to teach intensive language courses to refugees, while the second phase learners are attending regular primary schools. The majority are ethnically Chinese, and speak one of the S.E. Asian Chinese dialects as a first language; there are some who have Vietnamese as a first language and are ethnically Vietnamese.

Data collection involves three elicitation techniques, 1) Answers in a complete sentence to questions covering the most frequently occurring English tenses; 2) Repetition of sentences covering most of the clause structures; 3) Discussion of a variety of topics.

In the analysis I am especially interested in the order of acquisition of certain structures and their sequence compared with L1 English acquisition.

- "An Evaluation of the Contingency Program for Refugee Children," D. Spearritt and J. Coleman, Department of Education, University of Sydney, N.S.W. 2006, Australia.

The Australian Department of Education is funding an eighteen-month project to evaluate the Australian Government's contingency program which funds the States to enable Education Departments and other system authorities to provide facilities which will assist newly-arrived refugee children to acquire skills in the English language to the point where they can be readily integrated into the established school systems. In particular, the project aims to establish the degree of proficiency of the refugee children in English (speaking, reading, writing and comprehending spoken English) and their level of social adjustment after varying amounts of time in the program. Oral English is being assessed through interview situations, and written English mainly by dictation and cloze tests. Measures of computational skill and teacher ratings of social adjustment are also being collected. These measures are being obtained for samples of children aged 9-11 and 13-15 arriving in Australia in 1980 and enter in the contingency program in Sydney and Melbourne. The majority of the 600 children are from Vietnam, speaking either Chinese or both Chinese and Vietnamese, but Laotians comprise a substantial sub-group. Data will also be obtained on curricula, teaching methods and resources and the opinions of teachers and principals involved in the program.

In addition to the projects listed above, several questionnaires were returned listing organizations involved with Indochinese groups and languages. The following may serve as resources in this area of research:

National Indochinese Clearinghouse (NICTAC)
3520 Prospect St. NW
Washington, D.C. 20007
(800) 424-3750

Indochinese Refugee Action Center (IRAC)
1025 15th Street NW
Suite 600
Washington, D.C.
(202) 347-8903

Office of Refugee Affairs
Kay Rogers, Program Development
Room 1229, Switzer Bldg.
330 C Street SW
Washington, D.C. 20201

Office of Refugee Resettlement
330 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, D.C. 20201

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE)
Joel Gomez, Director
Suite B2-11
Rosslyn, VA 22209
(800) 336-4560

NCBE prepares information packets on Indochinese languages including resource organizations, publishers, and instructional materials. They publish a monthly newsletter, FORUM, dealing with many aspects of bilingual education and will do free information searches on topics in bilingual education.

Indochinese Materials Center
U.S. Department of Education
Region VII
Federal Building
324 East 11th Street
Kansas City, MO 64106

(The IMC has printed a bibliography of materials that has the purpose of assisting with the education and resettlement of Indochinese refugees. Their cataloging system includes series of texts for teaching English, materials for teaching Vietnamese, Cambodians, Laotians—including Thai Dam and Hmong—and Chinese-speaking Indochinese, as well as general resettlement and Asian culture information.)

Other sources of information on this topic are:

Trang Den Magazine - a weekly news magazine published in the United States every Saturday by Vietnamese refugees throughout the world. P.O. Box 192, Glendale, CA 91209.

The Southeast Asian Refugee in California - an article, including a list of California resources and references published in the CATESOL (California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) News, Volume 12/Number 2, September, 1980.

Asian Immigration Conference - a conference on Asian immigration issues to be held on December 12 and 13, 1980 at the Davidson Confererence Center of the University of Southern California in Los Angeles.

Entitled "Asian Immigration to the United States: Historical and Contemporary Issues," the conference will be sponsored by the Asian American Public Policy Program (AAPPP) and the California Council for the Humanitites in Public Policy.

Keynote addresses will be given by Professor Ron Takaki, U.C. Berkeley, author of the book, Iron Cages; attorney Ellen Ma Lee, executive director, One-Stop Immigration Center, Los Angeles; journalist Alex Esclamado, publisher, Philippine News, San Francisco; and Kyung Won Lee, editor, Koreatown News, Los Angeles.

Twelve specialized panels will deal with such topics as the impact of U.S. immigration and refugee laws on Asian immigration, the psychological adjustment of recent Asian immigrants and refugees to the United States, Asian immigrant literature, the demographics of Asian immigration, Asian immigrants and labor, Asian immigrants and bilingual/bicultural education, the nature of the relationship between the INS (Immigration and Naturalization Service) and the Asian American community, and the impact of Asian immigrants on race relations in California and the U.S.

Organizers of the panels include Professor Ling-Chi Wang, University of California, Berkeley; attorney Dick Osumi, People's Law College Legal Center; Russell Leong, Amerasia Journal; Professor Bill Hing, Golden Gate College of Law; Dr. Judy Chu, UCLA; Professor Chungsoo Lee, USC; Professor Yuji Ichioka, UCLA; and Professor Lloyd Inui, California State University, Long Beach.

Information is available from the Asian Immigration Conference Planning Committee, Asian American Studies Center, 3232 Campbell Hall, UCLA, Los Angeles, California 90024, (213) 825-2974.

The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) operates several toll-free "hotlines" to assist Indochinese refugees.

(800) 424-0212 - for general information on naturalization and citizenship education for refugees, and referrals to counseling agencies. This "hotline" is staffed by personnel who can respond to refugee inquiries in Cambodian, Cantonese, Lao and Vietnamese.

(800) 424-3750 - for technical assistance for educators.

(800) 424-3701 - general orientation and other information for refugees and sponsors.

The National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education (NAAPAE) will hold its Third National Conference, April 23-25, 1981, in Honolulu, Hawaii. For further information, contact: Dr. Teresita Ramos, (808) 948-8933.

The Council for Exceptional Children will sponsor a conference on The Exceptional Bilingual Child February 18-20, 1981, which will include papers on Indochinese students. For further information, contact: The Council for Exceptional Children, Conventions and Training Unit, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22209.

SOUTHWESTERN APPLIED LINGUISTICS: A SELECTIVE REVIEW,
Guest Editors: John W. Oller, Jr., Stephen W. Rose, Judith L. Brown, and Nancy Morales (Department of Linguistics, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico)[1]

> He could distinguish and divide
> A hair 'twixt south and southwest side,
> On either which he would dispute,
> Confute, change hands, and still confute.
>
> Samuel Butler (1612-1680, Hudibras, pt. 1,
> canto I, 1.67.

Previous research surveys have concentrated on compilation of recently published books and articles as well as in-depth coverage of conference papers originating or taking place within a particular geographic region. Also these surveys have tended to limit their focus to materials published or presented within about two years of the date of the survey. Our report deviates by beginning with a short history of the modern study of bilingualism in the Southwest and progresses to a selective review of research. We concentrate on what we believe are contributions that have both a history and a future. While coverage is far from complete, and filtered through our biases (both theoretical and

[1]The authors want to express special thanks to Garland Bills, Alan Hudson-Edwards, Jon Amastae, Betsy Brandt, Carole Edelsky, Charles Elerick, Florence Barkin, Bates Hoffer, Carolyn Kessler, Vera John-Steiner, Steve Strauss, Bess Altwerger, Patricia Irvine, Wayne Holm, Betty Lou DuBois, Donna Deyle, Leroy Ortiz, James Ney, Geoff Rogers, Mary Anne Chavez-Oller, and too many other colleagues and friends at UNM and elsewhere to mention. We are happy to share with them the responsibility for the comprehensiveness of this paper, but more particularly we cheerfully unburden them for any fault in the lack of coverage which we happily share with those few colleagues who did not respond to our letters.

practical), we do highlight some research paradigms that we feel are important and which in some cases may not be particularly well known to SLANT readers and second language acquisition (SLA) researchers.

A paper (in press) by Elizabeth Brandt, (Arizona State University, Tempe), "A realistic agenda in Native American languages for a border linguist," provides an excellent overview. Brandt begins her survey by referring back to a 1954 paper by Stanley Newman (reknowned University of New Mexico anthropologist and linguist) which marked an important renewal of interest in the unique cultural and linguistic aspects of the Southwest. However, a genuine renaissance began in 1967 when Hymes and Bittle published Studies in southwestern ethnolinguistics, and the movement gained momentum in the 1970s with the publication of Paul Turner's Bilingualism in the Southwest (1973). Among other contributions, it contained an article by Jacob Ornstein (University of Texas, El Paso), which identified over sixty specific research tasks covering a wide range of psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, and anthropological questions. In 1972, Ornstein also organized what was to become an important tradition, the first meeting of the Southwest Areal Language and Linguistics Workshop (SWALLOW). As Brandt notes, much of the current research in "border" linguistics is due to the organizational efforts of Jacob Ornstein and Garland Bills (Chairman of Linguistics at the University of New Mexico) in putting together the SWALLOW meetings, the Newsletter and Journal of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest (LASSO), and conferences for specialists in Uto-Aztecan linguistics, Kiowa-Tanoan studies, lexicography, Athapaskan languages, Spanish dialectology, and many others. Brandt refers to all of this activity as "an explosion of research" (p.3), but perhaps it should be noted that this burgeoning paradigm has leaned toward generalistic, descriptive, and weaker ethnographic methods rather than solid empiricism.

To have reviewed all of the research in this rapidly developing field would have been quite difficult, if not impossible. The California research alone would have easily inundated us. Therefore, we have made some exclusions and some difficult editorial decisions. Because of the prolific output of colleagues in California, much of the excellent work that originates there is not included. In addition, we have somewhat arbitrarily limited attention to two major categories of research: 1) research originating in the Southwest, which may have a fairly general interest; and 2) research that concerns specific SLA issues in the Southwest which has a more distinctive local flavor. Within each of these major categories we have identified several subdivisions (not without some overlap), and we have tried to especially highlight research with some empirical point.

I. RESEARCH ORIGINATING IN THE SOUTHWEST

LSA/TESOL Summer Institutes

In the summer of 1980, the University of New Mexico (UNM), Albuquerque, New Mexico, hosted the Second Annual TESOL Summer Institute along with the Fiftieth Linguistic Institute. In addition to a series of Forum Lectures featuring notables from both linguistics and applied areas, the institutes included fifty-seven courses on a wide variety

of topics in linguistics and related areas, as well as fifteen conferences including the annual summer meetings of the LSA and TESOL organizations. We will briefly highlight some of the Forum Lectures, several papers from the Language Testing Conference, the TESOL Summer Meeting, the LSA Summer Meeting, and a miscellany from other conferences of more specialized interest.

Key Forum Lectures

Stephen Krashen of the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, taught what turned out to be the most popular course at the summer institutes with 64 regular students and 40 or so auditors. He also gave what was rated by 187 respondents to an evaluative questionnaire, the most outstanding of eighteen Forum Lectures which included some of the top professionals in our field. Krashen (1980b) stressed the input hypothesis which he has discussed extensively elsewhere (1980a), the distinction between the largely subconscious process of acquisition as contrasted with the conscious process of learning (as he defines these technical terms), the notion of the ith and i+1 stage of development, and the net.

Briefly summarized, the input hypothesis claims that the acquisition of a second language is largely determined by access to and utilization of comprehensible input. (Frank Smith, in press, advocates essentially this same position.) The accessibility of comprehensible input may be limited by affective filtering or possibly it may be augmented by affective amplification (see Kanchana Prapphal, in progress). Under special circumstances, for instance when there is plenty of time available for processing, conscious monitoring may bring about learning which may possibly be converted into acquisition. However, Krashen argues convincingly that the monitor (that is the conscious aspect of language learning which attends to grammatical form and the like) probably does not contribute greatly to acquisition in normals—though it may in the case of some linguists, logicians, and other supermonitors who may be able to take notice of surface form while still keeping track of intended meanings. However, Krashen asserts categorically that normal users do not ordinarily attend to surface form— rather, they pay attention to meaning. (For the full argument and additional references, see Krashen 1980a and in press.)

Another Forum Lecturer who received high marks, second only to Krashen's, was Merrill Swain (1980). Among the important points discussed in her paper is the increasingly approved distinction between what Jim Cummins (one of Swain's co-workers at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Canada) has termed cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP) and basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS). In earlier work, Canale and Swain (1979, also see Canale 1980) laid the groundwork for a componential analysis of communicative

competence. Cummins' distinctions (1979a, 1980), fit nicely into such a model. According to his view, CALP is the large general factor of language proficiency associated with school performances which has been demonstrated in previous research (cf. Oller 1979; Oller and Perkins 1978b, 1980), while BICS is a somewhat more fundamental core of communicative skills that are common to all normal native speakers. In her discussion of "Time and timing in bilingual education," Swain offered confirming evidence for this distinction; however, it remains to be seen whether or not the distinction will hold up under closer empirical scrutiny. It may well be that CALP completely, or nearly completely, subsumes BICS. At any rate, it is still an exciting issue of current investigation (also see Cummins, in progress.)

Another brilliant performance was offered by M.A.K. Halliday (1980) who continues to astound both linguists and practitioners with his remarkable insights into the nature of language. His topic was, "It's a fixed word order language is English," and though it may be sometime before the practical applications and even research implications are sorted out, in evaluative remarks, participants commented frequently that Halliday's analysis of discourse is perhaps the most appealing of the competing alternatives. Joshua Fishman (1980) was also highly acclaimed by participant evaluators for his talk on "What's wrong and what's right with bilingual education?", and Bernard Spolsky, recently departed from the deanship of the UNM Graduate School to Bar Ilan University, Israel, was also highly rated for his discussion entitled, "Towards a sociolinguistics of literacy" (1980).

The Language Testing Conference

The first of fifteen conferences held during the TESOL/LSA Summer Institutes was initiated by John B. Carroll (1980a; University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill) in a lecture that served double duty both as one of the Forum series and also as the lead-off paper for the Language Testing Conference. His topic was "Psychometric theory and language testing." The primary thrust of Carroll's talk was to chastise Oller and Perkins (1980; Perkins at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale) and some of their co-workers— in particular, Scholz, Hendricks, Spurling, Johnson, and Vandenburg (1980)— for certain statistical methods. Carroll was especially disenchanted with the use of principal components analysis (PCA)—a procedure recommended by Nunnally (1967) but which enjoys little favor among factor analysis experts currently. The principal problem with the PCA method is its use of unities on the diagonal of the initial correlation matrix which is to be analyzed. This procedure tends to capitalize on error variance, thus inflating the estimated strength of the first principal component which has been taken by Oller and Perkins (1978b, 1980) as evidence for a large general factor of language proficiency. Upshur (1980) has also objected to the PCA method and has offered a proposal for correcting the tendency of PCA to inflate the general factor.

Carroll's option is to seek a Thurstonian simple structure through a somewhat more elaborate factor analysis procedure. The details of the method are statistically formidable, but the end result is a more elegant and non-inflated indication of the strength of a general factor, if one exists (and Carroll, 1980b, claims that such a factor cannot always be found), plus additional group factors which may be associated with such constructs as speaking as distinct from reading. Additional evidence along this line is provided in the breakthrough research of Bachman and Palmer (1980a, 1980b) and the version presented at the Language Testing Conference (1980c). The major contribution of Bachman and Palmer was to demonstrate the unquestionable existence of additional factors beyond the general factor. Their advance was dependent on two important improvements on previous studies: first, they used a more powerful statistical method—namely, confirmatory factoring (see Joreskog 1969); and second, they employed an extremely careful experimental procedure. However, it is important to note that in Carroll's reanalysis of Scholz et al (1980), and also in the Bachman and Palmer study, there is still clear evidence of a rather strong general factor. Carroll (1980a) insists that he never doubted that a general factor of language proficiency existed. Indeed, he regards the existence of such a factor as a given with rather trivial significance.

Another study employing the more powerful technique of confirmatory factor analysis was offered by Edward Purcell (1980). Along with the results of Carroll, Bachman and Palmer, and others, he too found evidence of a large general factor underlying a variety of language proficiency measures. However, Purcell was interested in differentiating the effects of learning and acquisition (cf. Krashen 1980a, and in press) in regard to the construct of pronunciation accuracy. His results did indeed seem to at least weakly support such a distinction. It would seem that the important advance afforded by his paper is again, as in the case of Bachman and Palmer, the demonstration of the utility of the confirmatory factoring method as well as the evidence that this method affords for mutilple component models of language proficiency. There is also evidence in his study that it may at last be feasible to differentiate sources of variance in language proficiency along secure empirical lines.

Frances Hinofotis of the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), and two of her students, Josette Molloy and Melinda Erickson, offered stimulating papers providing further evidence in favor of multiple-factor models of language proficiency. Hinofotis (1980a) showed that a three factor model (using classical factoring with oblique rotation—not PCA) provided a good and replicable fit to data generated in oral proficiency ratings. The three factors could be defined roughly in terms of language proficiency, delivery, and communication of information (her terms). These three categories are roughly synonymous with those proposed by Canale and Swain (1979)—namely, grammatical competence (knowledge of phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicon), sociolinguistic

competence (roughly definable as the ability to perform appropriately and persuasively), and strategic competence (the ability to make oneself understood). Molloy (1980) and Erickson (1980) both discussed tests of English for engineers —Molloy dealing with reading comprehension and Erickson with listening comprehension. Both authors found support for differential performance by engineers and non-engineers on ESP tests and general ESL tests. The engineers not only out-performed the generalists on the ESP tests aimed at engineering, but also on general ESL tests.

Bruce Porch of the UNM Medical School and Jack S. Damico, a UNM graduate student, both presented papers dealing with the much neglected area of children with various sorts of language processing disorders. Porch (1980) discussed the merits of a multidimensional quantification (as opposed to a single global score approach), and Damico presented evidence (see Damico, Goldstein, Wintheiser, and Oller 1980) demonstrating the weakness of several popular discrete-point approaches to the diagnosis of language disorders.

A provocative new approach to test research was offered by Harold Madsen and Mary Lee Scott (1980) of Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. Madsen and Scott argued convincingly that affect—in particular, attitudes toward testing procedures—should be taken into account along with the traditional criteria of reliability, validity, and practicality. The question Madsen and Scott addressed was simply what types of tests are more or less frustrating, and what can be done to make the objectionable procedures more palatable. Unfortunately they did not obtain data on the possible debilitating effects of tests with a high degree of frustration, but there were clear indications that degree of anxiety may affect score adversely and differently for students of different sociocultural backgrounds. Practice with the testing techniques and clarification of instructions seemed to reduce frustration levels.

Among the controversial issues broached by Hossein Farhady in his two excellent contributions (1980a, 1980b), were the plausibility of a general factor of language proficiency and the promise of a functional approach to language testing in lieu of the discrete-point and integrative methods. Farhady (1979) has also offered evidence that the disjunction between integrative and discrete-point tests is due merely to a fallacious way of looking at things.

Farhady insisted, and there was considerable concurrence on this issue at the conference, that both componential factorial models and more global general factor models are useful. However, he criticized the use of PCA as a basis for demonstrating the existence of a general factor for all of the reasons noted above (see especially Carroll 1980a, 1980b, and Upshur 1980, among others cited earlier.) He contended that other more cautious methods would still show a large general factor and that such a

notion is useful and likely to withstand the test of time. He urged caution, however, in the use of certain other statistical methods as well in connection with discourse processing tasks where the test "items" are not indepdent. In general, he claims that internal consistency estimates of reliability such as K-R 20 and 21 and Cronbach's alpha will yield inflated estimates of reliability when the assumption of item independence is not met—and it is never met in cloze, dictation, and other discourse-based tasks which are sensitive to constraints across sentence boundaries.

Farhady's functional approach to language testing is spelled out in great detail in his recent UCLA dissertation (1980c). Following the much discussed British tradition of notional/functional syllabus design, Farhady has developed test items for academic settings based on criteria of linguistic accuracy and social appropriateness. Various communication problems are described and the examinee must decide among several possible responses in each case. Farhady's results indicate considerable promise for the functional approach.

Among the several other papers presented was a defense of cloze procedure by James Brown (1980), another UCLA doctoral student, and more evidence on the importance of the language factor in education by Virginia Streiff (1980a; University of Texas, San Antonio). Streiff argued that there are excellent theoretical as well as practical reasons to suppose that performance even on "non-verbal" IQ tests and the like may indeed involve a rather large component of language proficiency. Streiff alluded to the considerable theoretical work of Fodor (1975) and others indicating the need, if not the necessity, for a deep language of thought which is essentially propositional in nature. Further, she cited evidence from Cattell and Horn (1978) in addition to data from her own studies demonstrating the difficulty of isolating a visual factor in so-called "non-verbal" tasks.

On the whole, it seems clear that a new consensus is coming about in spite of the many remaining controversies illuminated at the Language Testing Conference. There seems to be no dispute about the existence of a general language factor underlying performance on many sorts of language processing tasks. However, it is also now generally agreed that multiple component models are needed nonetheless. While Oller and Hinofotis (1980) had contended that multiple component models and a single factor model were mutually contradictory, it now appears that this claim was in error. In fact, the apparently conflicting models are complementary ways of viewing the same phenomena. It is also generally agreed that PCA is not to be preferred as a method of analysis. Some of the remaining controversies and a more detailed account of the emerging consensus are given in Issues in language testing research (Oller, in progress). That book will included selected articles from the Language Testing Conference as well as others that have recently appeared in various journals or at other conferences.

The TESOL Summer Meeting

The keynote address which initiated the Second Annual TESOL Summer Meeting was given by TESOL President H. Douglas Brown. Brown (1980) spoke somewhat eclectically concerning many issues in the profession. Patricia Irvine and Herta Teitelbaum, organizers of the meeting, had put the conference theme in the form of a question: "ESL—who's teaching what to whom?" Therefore, perhaps it was appropriate for Brown to speak in general terms about "The other side of the mountain." Other plenary speakers included Mary Galvan (a past president of TESOL), Dennis Preston (Professor of English at the State University of New York, Fredonia) and Jack C. Richards (then Director of the Regional English Language Center, Singapore, now Professor of English at the Chinese University, Hong Kong.) Galvan (1980) presented another of her stimulating talks on the importance of ESL to educators on a broad base. She also cited evidence for the effectiveness of certain bilingual vocational programs where English is taught in connection with job training. Preston (1980) offered some interesting, entertaining, and enlightening comments on the ethnography of teaching ESL, and Richards (1980) gave another of his usual creative and ground-breaking presentations that is certain to serve as a pace-setting effort. In the tradition of his work in error analysis, Richards has more recently broadened his scope of inquiry by contributing to some of the most seminal literature on pragmatics of ordinary conversation. His topic for the Summer Meeting was, "Conversation: what it is and what it isn't."

Among the thirty-four presentations in addition to the highly rated plenaries just mentioned, there was one whole section of papers on Krashen's monitor model. The two papers on the monitor topic which received the highest ratings were Jan Hulstijn's (1980) "Variability in interlanguage and conditions on monitor use," and Howard Shuldberg's (1980) "An examination of the importance of focus on form for second language monitoring."

Among various functional approaches to the teaching of ESL which were discussed was an especially highly rated talk entitled "Staging Shakespeare in the EFL program" by Charles Wukasch (1980) from the University of Silesia, Poland. Gloria Paulik Sampson of Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada, also received high ratings for her papers on "A functional approach to second language learning," (1980a) and "The languages of Cree children: development and dissolution" (1980b). Another paper that was judged especially useful was "Short-term teacher training program for adult ESL instructors" presented by Sharon Seymour (1980) of Alemany Community College, San Francisco.

A popular topic at the meeting was testing. Donna Ilyin and Cecelia Doherty (1980), also of Alemany Community College, discussed the

possibility of substituting multiple-choice cloze tests in a reading format for listening and structure tests both of which were authored by Ilyin. It was concluded that such a substitution would forfeit some meaningful (reliable) variance and is not therefore advisable. Sheila Brutten (1980) of Southern Illinois University, gave a highly rated paper on "A comparison of discrete-point and holistic measures of writing proficiency." Her paper addressed the much neglected problem of scoring compositions. Brutten's results confirm earlier research showing the utility of both types of measures.

A study which dealt with a non-traditional topic under the testing rubric was discussed by Jack S. Damico (see Damico, Storey, and Oller 1980.) He presented evidence showing that pragmatic criteria for evaluating language disorders in bilingual children are more effective and more valid than the commonly employed surface oriented criteria. Damico was able to show that bilingual children with genuine learning difficulties tend to reveal pragmatic problems such as topic maintenance, mazes, and referential non-specificity in both of their languages, while children who have no real learning problems, only a lack of knowledge of English, tend to show no pragmatic difficulties in the native language (Spanish). Children with learning problems (as identified by the pragmatic criteria) did indeed make little or no gain on teacher ratings and standardized individual achievement tests over the course of an academic year, while children who merely had difficulties with surface forms in one or both languages revealed normal gains in achievement.

The LSA Summer Meeting

Of the ninety-two papers presented at the LSA Summer Meeting, many were indirectly relevant to SLA, but few were directly on the topic. There was a relatively meagre section on "Educational Linguistics" which accounted for almost half the papers on SLA--a total of seven. Bjarkman (1980) of Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, talked about "Priorities in grading ESL composition," but unfortunately neglected to do any research. He did, however, offer some interesting opinions, the character of which is revealed in the following quotation from his abstract: "We are all fascinated with how the magician (in this case the language user/writer) creates and manages to maintain his illusions."

Leopoldo Widgorsky (1980) of the Universidad tecnica del estado, Chile, presented a paper in the same section entitled "Fatigue and language performance," in which he claimed to have found evidence that fatigue does not affect performance in the native language, but does have a significant effect on performance in EFL. Phonological let-downs were particularly noticeable. This paper is commendable for its attention to empirical facts, but it may be asked whether the native language tests are as sensitive to effects of fatigue as are tests in the foreign language. This question was apparently overlooked.

A stepped-up version of contrastive linguistics was offered in a paper entitled "Foreign language learning: transfer and predictability of the mother tongue," by Beban Chumbow (1980) of the University of Ilorin, Nigeria. Chumbow argued that sociolinguistic factors can be used to predict what contributions are apt to be made from a particular mother tongue to a particular second language. Such factors as prestige and medium of instruction used in the schools were asserted to have predictive value. The author avowed that his technique has practical applications in the adaptation of materials, but no supportive evidence was offered.

Celia Reyes-Hailey (1980) of the University of California, Berkeley, discussed the effect of knowledge of vocabulary in the first language on the acquisition of new words in the second language. Her results showed that knowledge of terms such as "luggage," "spigot," and "wrench" in English aided the acquisition of corresponding Dutch terms for the same objects. She concluded that development in the first language should be encouraged in order to maximize SLA. Another interesting paper was offered by Tuula Hirvonen (1980) from the University of Jyvaskyla, Finland, who studied the bilingual development of a child learning English and Finnish. Results disconfirmed certain expectations based on a theory of linguistic complexity offered by Slobin (1974).

Finally, there were three studies dealing with language contact. Johnson and Cooley (1980; both at the University of Oklahoma, Norman) described "Suprasegmentals in Indiana English." They claimed to have found certain patterns of intonation, vowel length, stress, and vowel reduction which were characteristic of the English of American Indians regardless of a number of variables such as sex and group affiliation. Hilde Dewulf (1980) discussed "Dialect interference and hypercorrection in Flemish Dutch." Her research in Flanders at the University of Gent, Belgium, reveals both interference due to the diglossic situation from Dutch to the Flemish dialects, and what the author refers to as "reverse" interference where the influence operates from Flemish dialects to Dutch (the standard language which has not replaced French.) The third study, by Higurashi and McClenon (1980) dealt with the commonly discussed SLA phenomenon of Japanese learners and the notorious l/r distinction. The authors contend that vowel systems should be considered when trying to explain this well-known phenomenon. A new twist was the explanation of the superiority of production over perception through both vowel coloring and consonant duration.

A Miscellany of Other Conferences During the Institutes

Rodney Young and Daniel Sharkey organized a Symposium on Neurolinguistics and Bilingualism. Featured speakers included such notables as Loraine Obler (1980) of Boston University, Fred Genesee (1980) of McGill University, Montreal, Canada, William S-Y. Wang (1980) of the University of California, Berkeley, Michel Paradis (1980) of McGill

University, and Amado Padilla (1980a) from UCLA. Topics ranged from the bilingual brain and second language learning to hemispheric specialization beyond sex and handedness. No special publication of papers is planned.

Amado Padilla (1980b) was a featured speaker at the Seventh Colloquium on Hispanic Linguistics where he spoke on the topic "Language acquisition in Spanish-English bilingual children." Other speakers at this conference included Leroy Ortiz (1980; UNM) on "Language maintenance in Arroyo Seco, New Mexico"; Rosaura Sánchez (1980; University of California, San Diego) on "Chicano code-switching"; Carmen Sánchez Sadek (1980; California State University, Los Angeles) on "Developing writing skills: adult bilingual speakers' code-switching patterns"; Erlinda Gonzales-Berry and Thomasina P. Hannum (1980; UNM) on "Diagnostic testing in a Spanish for Native Speakers Program"; and Silvia Brunat (1980; City College of New York), "Language prejudices in the Spanish for native speakers classes." John Bergen (UNM Modern Languages Department), Garland Bills, and other organizers are planning a volume of selected papers from that conference.

Code-switching also was one of the topics dealt with at the Fourth Andean Linguistics Workshop. Ana Maria Escobar (1980; State University of New York, Buffalo) dealt with "Factors influencing language choice among native Quechua-Spanish bilinguals." Also presented at that conference were several papers on literacy. This topic came up again and again throughout the Institute during the meetings and workshops. In fact it was a topic of major concern at the Language Policy Seminar, and was a frequent topic of discussion at the Symposium on Lexicography in a New World Context organized by Michael Silverstein and Charles Briggs, and at the Symposium on Athapaskan Comparative Linguistics and Language Planning.

In addition, there was a meeting of the Navajo Linguistics Society and another on Navajo Bilingual Education. This emphasis on Native American concerns was echoed many times over in other conferences such as the Uto-Aztecan Working Conference, the Symposium on Uto-Aztecan Historical Linguistics, the Kiowa-Tanoan Linguistic Conference, and even at the Summer Meeting of the American Dialect Society where Native American varieties of English were discussed by Beverly Olson Flanigan (1980; Indiana University, Bloomington) and Bates Hoffer (1980b; Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas.) At the same meeting, organized by Garland Bills (UNM), Manuel Godinez, Jr., and Mona Lindau-Webb (1980; both of UCLA) discussed Chicano English as did Jacob L. Ornstein-Galicia (1980).

LASSO/SWALLOW

Two organizations dealing with language in the Southwest which are very similar and yet distinct are the Southwest Areal Language and Linguistics Workshop (SWALLOW) and the Linguistic Association of the Southwest (LASSO). Even the acronyms have a similar ring to them, and people who attend their meetings tend to be drawn from the same pool of scholars.

LASSO

According to Garland Bills, the original plan was to see issues coming out at the rate of three per year. However, only one number of volume three appeared in 1978, and one in 1979. Several others are planned in order to accommodate the interesting papers presented at the most recent meeting which took place in October, 1980, at the Brown Palace in Denver. Helmut Esau of Texas A&M University (College Station) is slated to edit a general issue of selected papers from this meeting, and two special issues are planned. Carole Edelsky of Arizona State University will edit a series of papers from the conference on conversational analysis and Robert Longacre of the University of Texas, Arlington (also of the Summer Institute of Linguistics at Dallas) will edit an issue on discourse analysis (Longacre is President of LASSO). The regular Journal Editor is John G. Bordie of the University of Texas, Austin. The publication is accomplished at the Foreign Language Education Center and is sponsored by the Hogg Foundation.

Among the topics addressed by participants at the most recent meeting of LASSO were Chicano English (Manuel Godinez, Jr. 1980) theoretical linguistics, conversational analysis (especially see references to Marie-Laure Ryan, 1980; Helmut Esau and Annette Bristol-Plath, 1980; and Carole Edelsky, 1980), native American Languages, stylistics, reading, discourse analysis, general educational linguistics, and computing. The best paper by a professor as judged by participants was Carole Edelsky's "How to have the floor: two general ways," and the best paper presented by a graduate student, or in this case a team, was "Sharing-time in kindergarten: a study of the relationship between structure and content" by Susan L. Homer and Peggy Lazarus (1980) of UNM. As noted, some of these papers will no doubt appear in future issues of the LASSO Journal.

SWALLOW

SWALLOW is a loosely structured yet productive organization. The Proceedings of SWALLOW VIII, edited by Florence Barkin and Elizabeth Brandt (1980; both at Arizona State University) comprise a hefty 482 pages of material with many interesting contributions. There was a lapse

of two years between the Proceedings of SWALLOW VII (edited by Anthony G. Lozano 1978; University of Colorado, Boulder) and the eventual publication from SWALLOW VIII which more than doubled in bulk. At SWALLOW VIII over 75 persons participated in discussions and presentations, and 45 professional papers were offered.

In his keynote address at the VIIIth annual meeting, Rudolph Troike (National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education) made an impassioned plea for attention to meaning in language studies. Among other things, he observed (as have other applied linguists, semanticists, and philosophers before him) that in communication, "the result is more than the sum of its parts" (p.10). For this reason, he advocates attention to the "emergent aspect of meaning" or the "synergistic effect." Clearly anthropologists have tended to be influenced by different sources than some applied linguists, and yet, have eventually come to quite similar conclusions. Perhaps we should all be gratified when arriving at the same end point, even from different directions and years apart.

An insular approach to language is unfortunately reflected among several of the contributors to the SWALLOW (1980) Proceedings. Discouraging evidence of this lack of communication or awareness of appropriate relevant research appears in Margaret Orr's (1980) discussion of bilingual proficiencies of children. Although the scholar from Arizona does make some interesting case-by-case comparisons of performance of several instruments in Spanish and English, relevant research on the measures employed is regrettably neglected.

Thin ethnographic research seems to be characteristic of quite a few of the observational studies that comprise some of the reports given at SWALLOW meetings, but when doing linguistic analysis, some SWALLOW scholars felicitously seem to get a tighter grip on the data of interest—witness the analysis of "Cleft and pseudo-cleft in Tewa English" by William L. Leap (1980) of the American University, Washington, D.C. Other refreshing exceptions among the abstracts printed were the discussion of language maintenance and shift among the Crow by John Read (1980; then at University of Texas, El Paso, now at Regional English Language Center), and the paper by Bernard Spolsky and Patricia Irvine (1980; UNM) on the acceptance of literacy in the vernacular. Spolsky and Irvine offered the interesting thesis that non-acceptance of literacy in the vernacular may be perceived by some groups as a means of protecting their autonomy and integrity. The authors argue that this probability should be taken into account in "research and model-making" (p. 251). While both the Read report and the Spolsky-Irvine paper were anthropological and sociological in both their method and conclusions, neither of them was presented as experimental studies. They were, rather, thoughtful theoretical discussions.

A far less successful paper by McQuade (1980) purports to do much more. She discussed factors affecting the composition performance of students at Pan American University, Edinburg, Texas. Included in the article was a factor analysis (PCA, with varimax rotation) based on data where there was practically no variability to start with. Nonetheless, these data were factored, and conclusions (though cautiously put) were offered concerning both the inappropriateness of error analysis in general and the nature of composition. These conclusions cannot be regarded as justified.

Among the many interesting contributions on code-switching was a paper entitled, "Muy a tus ordenes: compliment responses among Mexican-American bilinguals," by Guadalupe Valdés and Cecilia Pino (1980; New Mexico State University, Las Cruces). Robert Stahl's (1980; Arizona State University) discussion of a model of learning offers a selective review of previous work in psycholinguistics and other areas though neglecting any pertinent work in applied linguistics. The paper on reading offered by Sara Rogers and Michael Haltresht (1980; Corpus Christi State University, Texas) advocates an archaic approach based on a discrete-point analysis of the reading process which is primarily interesting as an example of uninformed speculation. There is no evidence that the authors have ever heard of Kenneth Goodman's work, or Frank Smith's, or any of the pertinent research on the topic (see section on literacy).

In conclusion to our discussion of LASSO and SWALLOW, we feel constrained to comment that there needs to be a revolution in the thinking of linguists, applied linguists, sociolinguists, and the rest, whatever we may be called, such that all of us learn to put more store by substantiated empirical results.

The organizer of the IXth SWALLOW meeting is Charles Elerick of the University of Texas, El Paso.

Symposium on Spanish and Portuguese Bilingualism

This year the Symposium on Spanish and Portuguese Bilingualism took place in Juarez, Mexico, and was co-sponsored by New Mexico State University; the University of Massachusetts, Amherst; the University of Texas, El Paso; and the Joint Border Research Institute, Las Cruces, New Mexico. The co-organizers of the Symposium were Guadalupe Valdes, Juan C. Zamora, and Charles Elerick. The Hotel Fiesta Real was the site of the meetings on November 14 and 15. Many of the papers that were presented are of interest to SLA researchers. John Lipski (1980; University of Michigan, Ann Arbor) discussed bilingual competence, B. Leutke-Stahlman (1980; State College of Pennsylvania) addressed similarities in the treatment of hearing-impairment and bilingual education. (Many scholars are now interested in the fact that sign systems of the

deaf or severely hearing-impaired are tantamount to a kind of bilingualism.) Marta Luján (University of Texas, Austin) and Liliana Minaya (University of Connecticut, Storrs) talked about bilingual development (1980) along with Magda Maureira (1980; UNM). A panel consisting of Diana Natalicio (University of Texas, El Paso), Lucia Elias Olivares (University of Illinois, Chicago Circle), Mary Ellen Garcia (National Center for Bilingual Research, Los Alamitos, California) Celia Genishi (University of Texas, Austin) and Thomasina Hannum, discussed the Assessment of Bilingual Competence.

Publications of General Interest

The purpose of this section is to offer a highly selective sampling of research on the topics of literacy, bilingualism, models of learning, testing, and affect. There is some overlap with previous sections inasmuch as we sometimes draw from LASSO/SWALLOW publications here. In this section especially, we try to focus on research which represents a series of related efforts rather than single-shot studies. Inevitably we omit some important studies due to our own biases. In fact, it will no doubt seem artificial to many (as it does to us) to limit attention to research originating with persons based in the Southwest—excluding California. However, we hope the reader will appreciate finding out more about what is going on in a particular neck-of-the-woods as much as we have.

Literacy

About the only criticism that one hears these days of the outstanding work of Kenneth and Yetta Goodman on the reading process is that it is becoming a kind of neo-orthodoxy. If this is so, it merely speaks of the weight of the important research tradition which they initiated in the 1960s, and it sounds more like a compliment than a complaint. These researchers from the University of Arizona, Tuscon, have much to offer not only to those of us working in SLA in the Southwest, but worldwide. A recent quibble, though tempered with much praise, is that some of those who represent the Goodmanian position (if it may be called that) tend to do so in a sloganistic and overly simplistic manner. We believe that this tendency is best remedied by an acquaintance with the many publications by the Goodmans, one of the most complete of which is a report to HEW entitled Reading of American children whose language is a stable rural dialect of English or a language other than English (Goodman and Goodman 1978).

The authors' theory of reading is based on observations of what readers actually do and inferences that can be drawn from these observations. In the HEW report under consideration, the Goodmans discuss eight populations of subjects: four groups for whom English is a

second language (Navajo, Hawaiian Samoan, Arab, and Spanish groups); and four for whom standard English is a secondary variety of English (Downeast Maine, Appalachian White, Mississippi Rural Black, and Hawaii Pidgin). Subjects, 240 in all, read stories aloud and were recorded. Each child read two stories, one referred to as "standard" and another which had special cultural relevance for the child's vernacular language group. After reading each story, the children were asked to tell what they read. The Goodmans regard "miscues" as particularly informative clues for helping to unravel the mysteries of the reading process.

It is impossible here to do justice to their extensive report, but a brief quotation may help to sketch the position which they defend so well:

> Reading is a receptive language process. It is a psycholoinguistic process. . .that. . .starts with a linguistic representation encoded by a writer and ends with a meaning which the reader constructs. There is an essential interaction between language and thought in reading. The writer encodes thought as language and the reader decodes language to thought.
>
> . . .proficient readers are both efficient and effective. They are effective in constructing a meaning which they can assimilate or accommodate and which bears some level of agreement with the original meaning of the author. And readers are efficient in using the least amount of effort to achieve effectiveness. To accomplish this. . .readers maintain constant focus on constructing the meaning throughout the process, always seeking the most direct path to meaning, always using strategies for reducing uncertainty, always being selective about the use of the cues available and drawing deeply on prior conceptual and linguistic competence. Efficient readers minimize dependence on visual detail. Any reader's proficiency is variable depending on the semantic background brought. . .to any given reading task (p.2-1).

At least among these reading researchers and others like them (see Frank Smith, 1973 and in press), Troike's plea was heeded long before he issued it. The Goodmans also reach conclusions similar to those who have been working in language testing concerning the importance of viewing the use of language as a process—a totality greater than the sum of its parts. In this connection, there appears to be a deep similarity between the reading research and the findings of language testers.

It would require more space than is available to review the findings of the Goodmans adequately. However, a very useful (though brief) survey of the pertinent research is given by them (pp. xvi-xx) in their final report to HEW. One final quote: "Literacy is language. All language learning, to prosper, must be functional for the learner at the time of learning. All of our subjects know one or more forms of one or more languages well.

They have no difficulty learning language. If reading and writing are functional to them, they will learn them easily and well. Literacy can only be relevant and functional in the context of a relevant and functional curriculum. It simply is not possible to treat literacy as an isolated set of skills and expect children to learn (p.8-8)."[2]

Other studies of literacy originating in the Southwest which seem to bear mention are Bates Hoffer's arguments for a different kind of syntactic complexity index for studying maturation phenomena (1980a, 1980c); the 1980 paper by Spolsky and Irvine concerning acceptance of literacy in the vernacular cited above; and Diana Natalicio's 1979 paper on "Reading and the bilingual child." Hoffer thinks she has improved considerably on previous measures of syntactic complexity/maturity, and we are inclined to agree with the codicil that none of the surface-oriented measures has ever been very successful in empirical applications. Natalicio's recommendation that instruction in reading should proceed along any of three lines is interesting: first, she suggests using the vernacular language, which makes good sense in many situations; second, using non-standard readers; and third, using standard English. She insists that a solid oral foundation should precede reading instruction.

Bilingualism

One major study (among many) on the general topic of bilingualism is the book edited by Jacob Ornstein-Galicia and Robert St. Clair (University of Louisville, Kentucky) entitled Bilingualism and bilingual education: new readings and insights, published by Trinity University. The book is based on a conference that actually took place in 1975 at the University of Texas, El Paso, though the publication is dated 1979. In addition to a number of theoretical papers on bilingual education, Brooks and Calkins (1979) present results showing that Mexican-American students completing work for a bachelor's degree, at the University of Texas, El Paso, do as well as Anglos in grade-point average and length of time required for program completion. These results are encouraging in view of the fact that the Mexican-Americans in the study began with lower verbal and quantitative scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test and came from generally low socioeconomic backgrounds.

---

[2] We are indebted to our colleagues Steve Strauss and Bess Altwerger—both now at UNM in Linguistics and Secondary Education respectively and formerly of the University of Arizona, Tucson—for providing us with a copy of the Goodmans' report to HEW.

A particularly delightful paper is offered by the Harvard professor who in many ways helped to initiate the whole field of bilingualism in the United States, Einar Haugen (1979)—"Personal reflections on growing up bilingual." Other notables who have contributed papers of a reflective nature include Robert J. Di Pietro (1979; University of Delaware, Maryland), and the editors of the volume, St. Clair and Ornstein-Galicia (1979).

Another Southwesterner who continues to augment a long-standing tradition of studies in bilingualism is Vera John-Steiner (UNM). In October, 1980, she presented a paper at the Vygotsky Conference at the Center for Psychosocial Studies in Chicago entitled "The road to competence in an alien land: a Vygotskyan perspective on bilingualism." In addition, "The interactionist model of language development" (John-Steiner, in press) will appear soon. John-Steiner's work was undertaken while on sabbatical leave during the 1979-80 academic year at the University of Budapest, Hungary. In collaboration with Alexszander Jarovinszkij, she examined the occurrence of student errors in a trilingual setting—Russian, Hungarian, and Serbo-Croatian. With Russian being the target language, they found singificant interferences from the similar Slavic system, namely Serbo-Croatian, but not from Hungarian, which is a non-Indo-European language. Apparently it is the greater similarity of Russian and Serbo-Croatian which makes them difficult to keep apart in the trilingual's head while the very distinct Hungarian system is more easily maintained as an autonomous system. Multilinguals seemed to outperform monolinguals in any case.

John-Steiner's research was continued with an interviewing approach using subjects in the United States. She concludes that proficiency attained in the second language is largely dependent on the prior level of attainment in the native language. Further, she argues that in learning the second language, subjects tend to use strategies first developed in learning their native language. These conclusions accord well with findings in language testing research by Oller and Perkins (1978b) and by Cummins (1979a,1979b) showing a strong relationship between proficiency in the native language and attained levels in the target language. The importance of the John-Steiner work would seem to be primarily in its use of a genetic inquiry method (following a Vygotskyan approach; see Vygotsky 1978.) Excerpts from the interviews with adult learners are reminiscent of some of the diary studies done at UCLA.

Models of Learning

Both Krashen's monitor model (1976, 1978), which stresses comprehensibility, and Schumann's pidginization model (1978) were considered by Carolyn Kessler, David Harrison, and Curtis Hayes (1979) at the University of Texas, San Antonio. The authors examined the interlanguage system of 26 Saudi Arabians after completion of an intensive ESL program there. Results did not support the sequence of grammatical structures typical of the ESL materials used, but seemed

rather to sustain Corder's (1967) idea of a "built-in learner syllabus." The syntax of the subjects studied seemed to fit Schumann's pidginization model. Also, learners did seem to organize their communications along lines that would fit well with the monitor model.

At the 1979 TESOL meeting in Boston, James Ney (Arizona State University), argued for a two-stage theory of second language acquisition. On the basis of evidence from neurophysiology, language itself, child language data and applied studies, Ney contended that in the first stage the learner operates mainly by memorization based on imitation. He claimed that it is only later, during a secondary stage, that creative construction of the sort discussed by Dulay and Burt (1974) and Krashen (in press) can actually take place. On the basis of these observations Ney recommended imitation/memorization exercises in the early stages of second language instruction, only later to be followed by real-life uses which would encourage rule formation and utilization. We wonder if short cycles between the two "stages," alternating back and forth, might not make more sense (see Benson and Hjelt, 1980.) It seems clear that the learner must have something to work on before any grammar construction can take place; therefore, Ney's proposal seems to have some merit.

A Piagetian framework is invoked by Carolyn Kessler and Mary Ellen Quinn in their 1980 TESOL paper presented at San Francisco. They were able to show a significant contrast in the performance of bilinguals and monolinguals in both hypothesis formation and syntactic complexity favoring the bilinguals. Further, additive bilinguals outperformed subtractive bilinguals. These positive effects of bilingualism confirm earlier predictions by Cummins (1976) and suggest that affective and sociocultural variables must have considerable significance in determining both language development and cognitive growth in general.

Another study which suggests a close connection between sociocultural variables and language acquisition is offered by Carole Edelsky and Sarah Hudelson (1980). These Arizona State University researchers hypothesized that political and linguistic facts of the settings in which language instruction occurs (in bilingual classrooms especially) would affect the levels of proficiency attained by learners in the "minority" and/or "majority" languages. Indeed they found evidence that the minority language (Spanish in their study) was slighted in many ways, both by instructors and learners. Further, the attitudes which are apparently a function of the socio-political power structure seem to be primary factors in the maintenance of monolingualism by the "top-dogs" (the Anglos in their study.) In these hypotheses the authors followed Fishman (1976) and his ideas about "marked" versus "unmarked" languages. It could be argued, of course, that bilingual and other language programs are ineffective in getting children to learn much of anything that they do not already know or are not learning independently outside of the classroom. Therefore, some caution should be exercised in extending the very appealing model

proposed (or rather implied) by Edelsky and Hudelson. We will have to ask whether such a model would explain the near total failure of language instruction in general, or whether there may not, in fact, be other factors entering in as well.

Other authors contributing papers at the 1980 TESOL meeting stressed the extension of models appealing to affect into classroom practice. Jerrilou Johnson (1980; University of the Americas, Mexico City), for instance, seemed to be rather insistent that the student should even be "forced" to "function within the affective domain." At any rate, she seemed to suggest that some directive pressure was in order. Dennis Muchisky, Sharon Fujinaka, and Martha Furch (1980; UNM) also argued for a model of ESL learning which takes account of the importance of "social context." They too had some suggestions for revising ESL instructional materials to make them more responsive to "social contexts" of language use. Jonathon Seely (1980; University of Arizona,) also offered some remarks on knowledge of social context in his paper cleverly entitled "Merry Christmas from Mohamed, with sympathy." (Perhaps it should be mentioned here that some of the current models of language learning such as Krashen's monitor/input theory and pragmatic theory, incorporate important affective and sociocultural components. In the Krashen model there are the affective filters; in pragmatic theory, affect plays the dominant role in governing attention.)

A different approach to interlanguage theory is offered by Terence Odlin and Diana Natalicio (1980). They contend that lexical classifications may have been neglected in much of the writing on interlanguage systems. They cite such errors as, "John is the same tall as Bill" or "By accident he discovery something very interesting" which reveal the very important factor of grammatical categorization of the lexicon of an interlanguage system. Their observations suggest the need to amplify the dimensions of interlanguage error classification.

Testing

Among the most active areas of research is testing. Before Bernard Spolsky left UNM he edited two issues of a promising series published by the Center for Applied Linguistics. The first two volumes in the series have already appeared and others are planned. Advances in language testing: approaches to language testing (series: 2)(1978a),appeared, oddly enough, before series 1. It contains contributions by Spolsky himself (1978b), Elisabeth Ingram (1978), John L.D. Clark, (1978), Joshua Fishman and Robert Cooper (1978), and John Oller (1978b). Spolsky's paper is particularly important as it has been so widely and frequently cited for the distinctions he proposes there between three periods of language testing history—the prescientific period, the psychometric-structuralist

period, and the integrative-sociolinguistic period. (If Hossein Farhady (1980c) is correct, we may soon enter yet a fourth period of functional-pragmatic testing.)

Advances in language testing: some major tests (series: 1)(1979), as its subtitle suggests, deals with some major tests. It contains two excellent reports on the International Education Association study of foreign language achievement in French and English respectively, by John B. Carroll (1979) and E. Glynn Lewis (1979; Wales). Oller and Spolsky (1979) offer a paper discussing the development and research on the Test of English as a Foreign Language through 1976, and Paul Angelis (1979; Educational Testing Service) provides an update. Randall L. Jones (1979; Brigham Young University) deals with the famed Foreign Service Institute Oral Interview procedure, and Ellen J. Rosansky (1979; San Jose State University, California) the Bilingual Syntax Measure. (The Bilingual Syntax Measure was also reviewed by Oller 1976, and is considered extensively in Oller 1979.)

Two other books, both published by Newbury House, were co-edited by John Oller and Kyle Perkins. Language in education: testing the tests (1978b) raises the possibility that IQ and achievement tests may measure language proficiency to a much greater extent than psychometricians have sometimes assumed. This book, which consists of a collection of articles by Oller (1978a), Bjarni Gunnarsson (1978), Thomas A. Stump (1978), Virginia Streiff (1978), and Oller and Perkins (1978c), appeared in its first printing in 1978. (A sequel entitled The language factor: more tests of tests by Oller and Streiff is presently under contract with Newbury.) One of the advantages of this volume is that it consists entirely of papers dealing with empirical approaches to testing. A second volume (edited by Oller and Perkins) Research in language testing, appeared in 1980 and contains many more papers utilizing empirical methods for determining answers to questions about language learning and testing. Both books have been criticized for their use of PCA as a statistical method (see above discussion of Language Testing Conference.) This methodological problem is corrected in Oller and Streiff (in press), and also is discussed in detail in papers which appear in Issues in language testing research (Oller, in progress).

Among the papers that might be highlighted from Research in language testing is one on the importance of comprehension by Benson and Hjelt (1980). This paper is in fundamental agreement with the input hypothesis as set forward by Krashen (1980a, and in press). Another topic that is given extensive empirical treatment is oral proficiency—see especially the papers by Donn Callaway (1980; Southern Illinois University) and Karen Mullen (1980; University of Louisville.) Also, writing proficiency is accorded considerable study. For instance, Celeste

Kaczmarek (1980; Southern Illinois University) examines scoring and rating methods for evaluation of ESL compositions. Measures of syntactic complexity are discussed (and investigated empirically) by Douglas Flahive (Colorado State University, Fort Collins) and Becky Snow (1980; Southern Illinois University.) Jill Evola, Ellen Mamer,and Becky Lentz (1980; Southern Illinois University) examine discrete-point and global methods of scoring cohesiveness in composition. Other topics included are the factorial structure of language proficiency, the differences and similarities between native and non-native performance on language tasks, listening tasks, speaking tasks, and affective measurement. All of these and other topics are developed in greater detail by Oller in another book, Language tests at school: a pragmatic approach (1979).[3]

Interest in all aspects of language processing seems to be increasing, but tests of writing may well top the list of popularity. Dean Brodkey and Rodney Young (1980a; UNM) reported on "Composition correctness scores" both at the TESOL meeting in San Francisco (1980a) and at the Language Testing Conference at UNM during the Summer Institutes (1980b). Their results indicate some promise of validity for the composition scoring technique used by the English Tutorial Program at UNM. Other papers at TESOL 1980 on composition testing were presented by Susan S. Johnston and Jean Zukowski-Faust (1980; University of Arizona), and by Holly L. Jacobs and Stephen Zinkgraf (1980; Texas A&M University). (Readers who are especially interested in writing tests and teaching will want to watch for a whole new series of books from Newbury House authored by Holly Jacobs and her colleagues aimed at the writing curriculum—how to teach, test, and understand writing. Also to appear in 1981 is Frank Smith's exciting new book, Writing, mentioned above.)

The cloze procedure has been criticized severely in the last couple of years, but it still remains an important topic of research. Virginia Streiff (1980b) gave an excellent discussion of "Cloze in the classroom" (also see her book under contract with Newbury, forthcoming on the same topic). She concurs with other researchers in recommending native scores as the basis for a criterion against which non-native performance can be

---

[3] Oller is particularly grateful to colleagues at Southern Illinois University who helped make possible all three of the language testing books (the two Newbury House books in 1978 and 1980 with Kyle Perkins and the Longman book in 1979). All of them represent a team effort that was exerted by both students and staff at Southern Illinois University during the academic year 1976-77 when much of the work was completed.

meaningfully compared (but see Alderson 1979 and 1980 for cautioning remarks on overinterpreting native speaker scores). Also Streiff effectively answers some of the unfounded criticisms of Porter (1979) and Alderson (1979). Other research dealing with multiple choice cloze tests is offered by Jon Jonz (1980; East State Texas University, Commerce) and also by Frances Hinofotis and Becky Snow (1980). Jonz (1976) was, of course, one of the first to consider multiple-choice cloze formats.

Rodney Young, Director of the Testing Division at UNM, has published a paper entitled "A hierarchical approach to measures of language proficiency" in which he contends that cloze tests may measure something quite specialized such as "ready skill" (1979, p.89). He compares cloze with the UNM Communication Skills Test (CST, a kind of composition-dictation task), and with the American College Test (ACT), which is required of all entering freshmen at UNM. Young seems to assume in the hierarchical model which he proposes that the CST is indeed a measure of language proficiency for non-native speakers, but that there remains some question about cloze and the ACT. He writes, "the significant question, of course, is whether either ACT or the cloze approximate language proficiency at all" (p.89). This seems curious in view of the substantial variance overlap between all three tests. Elsewhere, Young seems to contradict himself by suggesting in the same article that all three tests may be measures of a general language proficiency which underlies both first and second language performances (also see Oller 1979.)

Four other testing studies originating in the Southwest may be mentioned. Yorozuya and Oller (1980) examine the possibility of a halo effect in oral proficiency scales. They find that raters are influenced in marking series of scales by the marks they have assigned on previous scales. This spillover, or halo effect, can be reduced by having raters evaluate oral performances on each scale (e.g., Vocabulary, Fluency, Grammar, and Pronunciation) at a separate hearing. Some of their other conclusions, however, concerning the validity of the scales (or rather lack of it) are challenged by Upshur (1980) and by Upshur and Homburg (in progress). In particular, Upshur claims some specificity (reliable and unique variance) in each of the four scales investigated, indicating that they do have some divergent validity. (Due to their use of PCA, Yorozuya and Oller, incorrectly claimed no divergence of the scales.)

The three remaining studies to be considered all deal with diagnosis of language disorders or learning disabilities. Robert C. Weissberg and Stephen S. Farmer (1980; New Mexico State University) presented a paper at TESOL 1980 concerning cases of ESL students with such problems. Another study which has been mentioned above in connection with the TESOL 1980 Summer Meeting concerned the diagnosis of language disorders in Spanish-English bilingual children in the Albuquerque Public

Schools (Damico, Storey, and Oller 1980.) Results of the latter study showed that pragmatic criteria were superior as diagnostic tools over the more traditional surface syntactic and morphological criteria commonly used by speech and language pathologists.

Another study by Damico and Oller (1980) demonstrated that referrals drawn from a population of 1212 Albuquerque Public School children (not limited to bilinguals in this case) were more accurate when teachers were trained to look for certain pragmatic difficulties (e.g. mazes, poor topic maintenance, poor deixis, etc.) rather than the syntactic/morphological difficulties in surface form that speech and language pathologists usually are on the look-out for. Teachers trained to use the pragmatic criteria not only referred a greater number of children than teachers trained to look for the traditional surface troubles (e.g., noun-verb agreement, possessive inflections, tense markers, auxiliaries, etc.), but the children referred by the teachers looking for the more obvious pragmatic difficulties were later diagnosed as having genuine disorders a greater percentage of the time. Out of 48 referrals, 40 were judged to be correct from the pragmatic group while out of 31, 19 were judged correct for the surface-oriented group. (The accuracy criterion was a rigorous evalution plan specified by the State of New Mexico regulations for Special Education Services.)

Affect

We interpret this category broadly, including everything that does not seem to fit obviously into the complementary category of cognition. For instance, a ground-breaking study by Gail Guntermann (1978; Arizona State University,) concerned degrees of negativity in reaction to errors of English speakers learning Spanish. The question posed was what kinds of errors are most irritating to the native Spanish interpreter. Guntermann believes that information on this issue may be useful to teachers and learners of Spanish—not to mention other languages to which the method, if not the results, might be generalized.

Another type of affective research reported on recently by Madsen and Scott at the Language Testing Conference (1980) concerned attitudes toward testing techniques (see above). Their work suggests that some types of tests, like some kinds of errors, are more annoying and harder to adjust to mentally than are others. Cloze tests, for instance, seem to elicit in some students a rather negative reaction. The annoyance reported may be something like the reaction that one has when turning on the radio and encountering too much static to understand the program. For the same reason, some years ago, Johansson (1973) criticized The Spolsky-Gradman Noise Test. Some students just rebel at the idea of being asked to listen to what, for all intents and purposes, appears to be a sloppily made tape-recording. Distortions of the sort that cloze procedure

imposes may be objectionable for similar reasons (see also Shohamy 1979.) However, it remains to be seen whether or not such reactions generally affect performance. Why, for example, should reliabilities and validity coefficients remain high if negative reactions are really having substantial effects on performance? Perhaps what is needed is case-by-case examination of individual performances—as in introspective after-the-fact interviewing, coordinated with examination of multiple test scores for a single individual.

The more usual interpretation of affective research, on the other hand, contrasts markedly with the types of studies considered in the preceding paragraphs. Normally, SLA researchers think of the kind of research done by Robert Gardner and Wallace Lambert (1972) among others. They have tended especially to emphasize the study of attitudes toward the target language culture and its representatives.

Other authors such as Walcer and Rodriguez-Brown (1979, originally presented at the University of Texas, El Paso, bilingual conference in 1975) stress the importance of self-concept. Their method, a case-study of a single child, does not seem too promising by itself, but they refer to a considerable number of more empirically oriented studies. However, as in the case with affective research of the social-psychological type in general, the research cited is often in conflict. For instance, the authors cite evidence showing that Puerto-Rican children have lower self-concepts than Anglos (Zirkel 1971); that the relative self-concepts are not significantly different (DeBlassie and Healy 1970); and that "culturally 'disadvantaged' " children seem to have stronger self-concepts than Anglos (Soares and Soares 1969). Unfortunately all of these possibilities seem contradictory—together they exhaust the logically possible outcomes of such a comparison ($P < A$, $P = A$, and $P > A$).

Another interesting approach to affect in bilingual settings was offered by Lindenfeld and Carrasco-Schoch (1979, also originally presented at the University of Texas, El Paso, conference in 1975), following the Gardner-Lambert tradition. The authors used the Bilingual Syntax Measure and a questionnaire to assess attitudes and proficiency of bilingual Mexican-American children. One difficulty was that only small numbers of subjects were available. In spite of inconclusive results, the authors remained convinced that social and psychological variables in addition to "political and economic aspects of life" (p. 51) as well as "the total life pattern" (p.52) of those receiving bilingual programming must all be taken into account. One is easily discouraged by the rapidity of branching that such recommendations seem to lead to. There appears to be no end to the new complexities that can be added on.

Because of the difficulty of the subject matter itself, and also because of the problems associated with getting valid measures of affect, research often seems to lead to conflicting results. A series of studies at UNM, initiated under the leadership of Alan Hudson-Edwards, illustrates the difficulties that seem to be characteristic of work in this area. Hudson-Edwards and one of his students, Phyllis Fei Liu, undertook a study to relate attained proficiency in ESL to attitudes of Chinese students toward themselves, Americans, Chinese people, reasons for coming to the United States, and the like. Early on they involved the first author of this report and a series of affective studies followed.

The first was published in 1977 (Oller, Hudson, and Liu), though the results had been analyzed and re-analyzed many times between 1975, when the study was begun, and its eventual publication date in 1977. By then, three other parallel studies had also been completed and were published at about the same time. The first study, with Chinese subjects, had suggested that a positive self-concept and positive attitudes toward both the native language group and the target language group might all be about equally conducive to success in learning ESL. The other studies were undertaken in hopes of confirming this finding. The second study (Chihara and Oller 1978) was actually published later than the third (Asakawa and Oller 1977) and the fourth (Oller, Baca, and Vigil 1977). Since the results of these studies are reviewed in greater detail by Oller (1980b), we will simply point out that the pattern of relationships changed in each of the four studies so radically that it was difficult to find a consistent interpretation that did not call into question the measurement techniques—in particular the method of obtaining affective scores from self-report questionnaires.

In an attempt to address the measurement problem more directly, Oller and Perkins (1978c, Ch.5) and collaborators who contributed to Oller and Perkins (1980) undertook another series of studies. Among the questions asked was whether such extraneous sources of variance as mere consistency, self-flattery, and social approval might explain the apparent non-random variance in such studies where it exists (occasionally, and without apparent reason). Oller and Perkins (1978c), with the help of H. Douglas Brown at the University of Michigan (then; now at the University of Illinois, Urbana) and colleagues at Southern Illinois University, were able to show a substantial correlation between self-ratings on certain bipolar scales and valuation of those same scales. If subjects thought that being talkative rather than quiet, was good, for instance, they would tend to rate themselves as talkative, and the reverse if they thought being quiet was preferable. This demonstration they took as evidence of a self-flattery factor. If such a factor were to work in combination with social approval motives and the desire to be consistent, the questionnaire aimed at attitudes would become a kind of language test in itself. In order to give non-random answers to questions such that one aims at social

approval and self-flattery (and being consistent), one must first understand the questions and the values which the writer of the questionnaire had in mind.

Subsequent research by Oller, Perkins, and Murakami (1980) revealed still further difficulties with attitude questions in standard format, as did work by Johnson and Krug (1980). Oller and Perkins (1978a, 1978c) and Oller (1980b) concluded that the affective measures were of questionable validity. Upshur, Acton, Arthur, and Guiora (1978) offered a rebuttal intended to restore confidence in affective measures (or possibly to prove other measures equally suspect), but Oller and Perkins (1979) remained unconvinced of the validity of the affective measures commonly used by researchers in SLA and in other areas as well. A continuation of the debate is being organized by William Acton(University of Houston, Texas) for TESOL 1981.

II. RESEARCH ON SOUTHWESTERN POPULATIONS

Many of the entries in earlier sections could have been mentioned here as well. However, the intent of this last section is to call attention to a number of research projects of some scope that may not be well known to SLANT readers and that have special significance for populations in the Southwest. They are roughly divisible into sociolinguistics of multilingualism and educational studies.

Sociolinguistics of Multilingualism

The Martineztown Study

According to Hudson-Edwards and Bills (in press), 40% of the population of New Mexico claims to be of Hispanic heritage and 81% of the Hispanics claim Spanish as their mother tongue. The Martineztown study is an investigation of a barrio in Albuquerque "in an effort to characterize in finer detail the mechanism of language shift" (p.2). According to a recent study cited by Hudson-Edwards and Bills, 97% of the approximately 2,000 people living in Martineztown are either Spanish surnamed or report using Spanish as their primary language. However, a 10% survey of those presently living in the barrio reveals a stark picture of language shift. Hudson-Edwards and Bills observe, "although the language is still very much alive in Martineztown . . .the signs of a large scale shift are everywhere in evidence. The children of heads of households claim Spanish alone as a mother tongue with only half the frequency of their parents' generation. They much less frequently claim a fluent knowledge of Spanish and at the same time much more frequently claim a fluent knowledge of English. They claim to use Spanish as their primary home language with scarcely more than a third the frequency their parents do" (p.23).

The authors conclude that the prospects for the maintenance of Spanish in Martineztown over the long-term are not too encouraging. More importantly, perhaps, the conclude that the "process of language shift can be detected in its early stages within a single generation when the proportion of ethnic mother tongue claimants exceeds the proportion of fluent speakers of the language and when the latter, in turn, exceeds the proportion of those using the ethnic tongue as their home language" (p.23). The prognosis for the future is a more rapid acceleration of loss of the mother tongue in successive generations.

Bilingual Election Services

One of the most interesting questions of language policy in a more-or-less democratic republic is the matter of providing the opportunity for suffrage to bilinguals and non-English speaking minorities. An extensive study of the present state of affairs in U.S. policy has recently been completed by Hudson-Edwards, Astiz, and Lopez (1979). A brief quote from their Final Report to the Federal Election Commission will summarize both the problem and some of their major findings:

> The 1975 amendments to the Voting Rights Act require that certain states and political subdivisions now provide comprehensive bilingual voter services in the interest of facilitating access to the electoral process for language minority citizens.

(We should not here that over 80% of the affected jurisdictions fall into major states of the southwest including Oklahoma and California along with New Mexico, Arizona, and Colorado.)

> The purpose of the study summarized here was to obtain information from election administrators and from community spokespersons regarding the nature and the extent of efforts to provide such services. The data show that vigorous efforts to provide such comprehensive services have been extremely limited. This state of affairs seems to be largely attributable to a widespread misunderstanding on the part of local election administrators: firstly, that just formalistically making bilingual services available, without bringing them to the language minorities through the links of community organizations, will produce any great demand for them; and, secondly, that the point of the legislation is primarily to have bilingual forms available and that the appropriate measure of its success, therefore, is the number of bilingual forms used (p.17).

Another major difficulty noted in the study was that provision of bilingual election services is limited because of the near complete lack of

information concerning the distribution of bilingual communities and the extent to which they need such services—the Census information being inadequate as regards the distribution of language proficiencies in both vernacular and majority languages. It is difficult to say whether such societal practices as are represented in the response to the Voting Rights Act will have great or little impact on the complexion of multilingualism in this country. Although it was not within the scope of the Election Services Project to look into this question, it seems safe to infer that the legislation has had relatively little impact on voting practices of minorities in the United States. By virtue of the fact that minority voters in many areas have been effectively excluded from participation in the past, services which are delivered only to participants cannot be expected to have any notable impact on non-participants.

The Measure of Adult English Proficiency

Another project concerned at least indirectly with societal language policy in the United States was conducted with Federal funds by the Resource Development Institute of Austin, Texas. The deep objectives of the project concerned calibration of the language question on the 1980 Census, and the provision and accessibility of social services to minorities. For instance, what is the likelihood that a person indicating little knowledge of English will be barred from access to social services of the sort provided by the many branches of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW)? The development of a Measure of Adult English Proficiency (MAEP) was one of the steps taken to attempt to address these deeper questions. The test developed by the Resource Department Institute represents a milestone in language testing research. Further, since the field trials of the test were done with populations primarily based in the Southwest, it is of relevance here.

The design of the entire project, the three field trials of the test, its several revisions, and the final product are all admirably described in the Final Report by Scott (1979). In its final version, the MAEP was divided into two major sections—oral and written. The first battery of tests under the oral category was aimed at listening tasks. There were two basic procedures—imperatives and paraphrase recognition. In the first instance subjects had to indicate comprehension of English commands by following certain verbal instructions. In the second set of items, subjects merely indicated with a "yes" or "no" whether two statements meant the same or not. The second battery of tests under the oral category consisted of both listening and speaking tasks. The first set of items consisted of questions presented orally to be answered orally by the examinee. The second set consisted of statements to be repeated by the examinee (an elicited imitation task).

The second major category of items consisted of literacy-aimed tasks. The first subset was aimed at reading and the second at reading and writing. Under the reading only category, subjects performed two types of task: first there were items of a more or less traditional reading comprehension type, and second there were multiple-choice cloze items based on the sorts of texts clients normally have to perform in order to quality for social services provided by HEW. Under the reading and writing category, again there were two types of tasks: a written questionnaire to be filled in by the examinee, and a standard fill-in-the-blank cloze test.

In all cases the preparation of tests was based on a careful content analysis of the types of language processing tasks required of clients in HEW agency-client interactions. Also, there was a concerted effort to avoid meaningless items that had no experientially meaningful basis. Discrete-point items of the disconnected type were avoided. Sequentiality of text, coherence, and, in general, meaningfulness were top priority for inclusion in any of the tasks. The items of the paraphrase-recognition type (listening-only category) were the ones where meaningful sequence was most tenuous. Nevertheless, the item analyses for all subtests revealed strikingly high reliabilities and internal consistencies for all subtests and for each item throughout the test battery.

Five subgroups were tested in the third field trial—Spanish-speaking (divided into Mexican-American rural, Mexican-American urban, and Puerto Rican), Native American (from two distinct groups), Chinese, Vietnamese, and English-speaking. 573 subjects were tested in the third field trial with 40 being the smallest number in any subgroup and 108 the largest. In addition to the tests described above, subjects were asked to rate themselves on ability to speak, read, and write English (three separate scales), and on the basis of a short interview by a trained linguist they were rated for speaking proficiency. Among other things, the pattern of intercorrelations for all of the subtests and these self-ratings and the linguist's rating were examined. Oller (1980a) also reports a principal components analysis over the resultant correlation matrix showing a surprisingly high interrelationship of all the variables examined. While this analysis is subject to the complaints voiced by Upshur (1980) and others, it seems to indicate nonetheless a high degree of communality among all of the scores obtained. This may be read as evidence of concurrent validity. Perhaps with the more sophisticated techniques of Jöreskog (1969) employed by Bachman and Palmer, and also by Purcell, it would be possible to tease out some unique reliable variance associated with the speaking tasks but not with the literacy tasks and so forth. This, however, has not been done, but reliabilities for subscores for all of the groups tested are remarkably high as are item discrimination indices—the latter always being above .54.

Spanish Testing in New Mexico

Sam Guyler, Erlinda Gonzales-Berry, and Thomasina Hannum, all of UNM, have developed a diagnostic test for speakers of Spanish. The test is intended for use as a part of the certification requirements for teachers who would work in bilingual English/Spanish programs in the state. It consists of six parts: (1) acceptability judgments based on sample utterances; (2) a cloze test aimed at familiarity with written Spanish; (3) a task requiring recognition of orthographic errors; (4) a grammar section aimed at formal training; (5) a reading comprehension test at two levels of difficulty; and (6) a composition to be written in Spanish. In a report presented by Gonzales-Berry and Hannum (1980), no evidence was given concerning the reliability or validity of the instrument. The test is interesting as it may represent the first step toward some sort of examination for bilingual teachers in the United States. It is to be hoped, of course, that the present effort will be viewed as merely a first faltering step toward systematic proficiency evaluations for bilingual teachers.

Navajo Testing

An ethnographic analysis of testing of Navajo children in the schools is in progress by David Bachelor (UNM) and Donna Deyle (Southwest Research Associates) in Albuquerque (1980). They claim that theirs is the first ethnography of testing to be conducted in a bilingual setting. The principal investigators feel that differences in values and perceptions may influence performance in adverse ways, and that such contrasts need to be taken into account by educators and policy makers. They hypothesize that factors of time, anxiety, and ethnicity may contribute to the poor showing of Navajo children on tests. They hope to change the practice of analyzing tests primarily in terms of statistical properties—what they refer to as "one-dimensional" analysis. It is to be hoped that they will not neglect that dimension entirely, however, and it remains to be seen what benefits will accrue to Navajo children as a result of this NIE funded project.

Sociolinguistics of Literacy

Another NIE project is underway to study the sociocultural and ethnographic characteristics of literacy. (Spolsky, Engelbrecht, and Irvine, in progress). According to Spolsky's 1980 Forum Lecture, the intent of the study is to develop a sociolinguistic model based on historical and comparative data and tested in field observation.

Educational Studies

The Pan American University Studies

We interpret the category of "Educational Studies" rather broadly since it includes a variety of studies with divergent points of focus all

primarily concerned with the competence/performance of bilinguals in educational settings. For instance, a major study in bilingualism with an emphasis on writing processes was begun at Pan American University (PAU) in 1975. Although the study was originally conceived as a general investigation into the bilingualism of PAU students, the researchers (including Jon Amastae, Lucia Elias-Olivares, Judy McQuade, Hugo Mejías, and Nicholas Sobin) have focused more specifically on the relationship between sociolinguistic background and attained proficiency in English composition for bilinguals or second language learners.

A good overview of this project is "Investigating bilingualism on the boarder: a review," by Amastae (in press). Data for this series of studies was collected by means of a Sociolinguistic Background Questionnaire (SBQ), writing samples, interviews in both Spanish and English, and an English Syntax Elicitation Device (Sobin, 1977). An interesting portrait of both the student population and the bilingual setting resulted from the SBQ, and evidence was found for language shift and language maintenance with an unusual reversal from the familiar patterns of Spanish at home, English in other domains. The highest ratings of Spanish proficiency were at the highest and lowest socioeconomic status. Confidence in Spanish decreased as the SES rose, until the highest levels were reached. A significantly high number of subjects who claimed Spanish as a first language characterized themselves as having greater overall fluency in English, and of these, a large majority still use Spanish as the primary language at home. Finally, there was a group who reported learning both Spanish and English simultaneously as a first language. This sample offers great potential for future in-depth study.

The core of the work on this project (primarily by Amastae 1978, 1980 and in press a and b; and Sobin 1977, 1978 and 1980) has been directed toward an analysis of writing samples of bilinguals using the methods of error analysis and elaboration analysis first developed by Hunt (1965) and Loban (1976)—a moderate variation of Hunt's "T-Unit" in order to examine the development of complex sentence structure and measure transference and inversion. As in the work of Loban, relationships among types of syntactic elaboration items were examined. The factors with strongest influence seemd to have little to do with language background and ethnicity, but were almost exclusively literacy and standard usage errors of the type all students, not just bilingual ones, tend to make. There was little or no evidence of transfer or interference of transformational rules.

Although we must question the use of the "T-Unit" as a measure of stylistic maturity, the attempt by the PAU researchers to study the writing process empirically is a laudable one. Why is it that there is such a paucity of "hard" research into this most important area in SLA? Is

composition, like affect, so slippery that we fear the "handle" will continue to escape us? We think not. What is badly needed is a large scale study of writing processes modeled after the Goodmans' comprehensive study of reading. At any rate, the PAU project is ongoing, and although the researchers are now scattered around the country, very possibly we are seeing the seeds of important future research.

Rock Point

The long-awaited final report on the Rock Point study was published in October 1980 by the Center For Applied Linguistics (Rosier and Holm 1980). Largely based on Paul Rosier's dissertation (1979), this report contains the complete analysis of the data from Rock Point and an extensive introduction by Holm. What is particularly significant about this study is that it is not sponsored by an agency, but is rather the record of the school staff working to monitor the program in order to assure the viability of their work. It is the kind of longitudinal evaluation of bilingual education programs that is desperately needed in this country. In addition, it is ethnographically sound (a refreshing exception) in its description of the community and the school where the program took place. (Also see Rosier and Farella, 1976).

In the introduction, Holm summarizes the major findings: "Despite the fact that they did not begin reading in English until midway through the second grade, the bilingual group had statistically significant higher mean scores on the SAT subtests for Total Reading than did the EFL direct method group at all grades above the third. Similar results were obtained with the MAT subtests. . .At each higher grade, the bilingual group's mean score for Total Reading and Total Arithmetic tended to diverge further from those of the EFL direct method group and converge closer to those of the national norms" (Rosier and Holm 1980, p.2).

These results should be widely known by now, but the value of the present volume is that the study is presented in its entirety. More importantly, it reflects the real influence that applied linguists working in the "field" can have on bilingual programs here in the United States. In this case, the efforts of Spolsky and various colleagues at UNM were instrumental in the development of the Rock Point experiment, and the results are, at the very least, satisfying. Unfortunately, if the evaluation of bilingual programs continues to be the exclusive domain of Federal bureaucracies and educational generalists, the future of bilingual education in this country may be quite uncertain.

Border Linguistics

This term has recently come into existence to describe the unique multilingual climate of the Southwest where language contact among widely divergent populations of Hispanics, Anglo-Americans, and Native Americans has spawned a variety of linguistic and sociolinguistic

phenomena to be studied. For example, studies relating to language loyalty, maintenance, and dominance, as well as code-switching and mixing reflect an areal perspective that has interested a number of researchers. Unfortunately, the temptation to do contrastive analysis is strong, and a few have succumbed to its not so subtle charms.

An interesting exception is provided by Marc Schnitzer, now at the University of Puerto Rico, in a 1980 study entitled "A case grammar approach to Spanish-English contrastive analysis." He attempts to give new life to the deep case hypothesis by demonstrating that the word order phenomena in Spanish are better described as "tendencies" rather than "restrictions" because more than fifty percent of the sentences analyzed showed no clear consensus of native speaker judgments concerning grammaticality. He argues that although case grammar does suffer from the same defects as other forms of transformational grammar, it should not be discarded entirely as a useful tool in language teaching. Although the argument seems persuasive, the practical application of the method is not clear.

Yolanda Solé, in an article published in LASSO (1979), looks at Hispanic organizational interest in language maintenance, and seeks to determine if there exist any organizational background characteristics that may distinguish linguistically more retentive Hispanic organizations from their less retentive counterparts. The findings concur with Fishman (1966, 1972) that language attitudes are weaker predictors of language usage than other variables such as immigrational recency and relative age of their members.

In a related study, Charles Elerick and Karen Ramirez (1980) of University of Texas, El Paso, seek a functional definition of language dominance and propose a model for determining dominance in bilinguals. They contend that both Cohen's (1975) and Jakobovits' (1970) views are constricting and defeatist in scope, and outline a complex measurement of bilinguals' "total linguistic reality." Six factors, or domains, are identified as crucial for such a measure: (1) speaker's linguistic ontogony; (2) speaker's bipolarity; (3) speaker's bivalency; (4) speaker's relative proclivity to code switching; (5) speaker's patterns of initiation and response in both languages; (6) speaker's attitude toward the two languages. The authors provide a sample evaluation form in the Appendix which, unfortunately, may confirm the impossibility of the task as determined by Cohen and Jakobovits. It is an ambitious undertaking that merits consideration by sociolinguists involved in bilingual research, but certainly not to the neglect of the significant empirical research on these questions.

Rodolfo Jacobson (1978a, 1978b) of the University of Texas, San Antonio, offers some fresh insights into code-switching as a positive sociolinguistic phenomenon. He sees it as a valid and acceptable ethnic dialect and explores how this verbal behavior can and should be exploited in order to develop more effective means of educating bilingual children.

In a well designed empirical study, he formulates a general theory of code-switching which might be applicable to settings outside the Mexican-U.S. borderlands. Two variables, "anticipatory embedding" and "imaginary content," were identified as examples of consistent "switching triggers."

Two much less successful studies by Ana Huerta (1980) of the University of Texas, El Paso, and Brian Warner (1980) of Arizona State University, address some of the theoretical issues involved in the description of bilingual speech, but in the case of Huerta, her data analysis is based on a single conversation between two Spanish/English native speakers and proves inadequate to support her hypotheses. Warner's programmatic article calls for the formulation of an explicit grammatical description of code-switching.

Florence Barkin's (1978) work in the area of anthropological linguistics is apparently well grounded. Her studies of "loanshifts" as an example of multilevel "interference" in bilingual speech may play an important role in our understanding of the acculturation process that second language learners go through when they attempt to fuse cultural and linguistic phenomena. Like Jacobson, she sees interference as a positive manifestation that can provide the linguist with evidence for linguistic and cultural change on many levels "under the guise of lexical interference." Furthermore, loanshifts can give us insight into the experiential knowledge and the processes that are taking place in the mind of the bilingual.

Test Validity Studies

Two studies bear mention here, both of them conducted by Virginia Streiff at the Hopi reservation in Northern Arizona. The question in both cases concerned the extent to which test performance may be determined by language proficiency—namely in English. In 1978, Streiff reported results with children in first through sixth grade at Hopi showing that performance on the California Achievement Tests (CAT) was largely a function of proficiency in English. In fact, it was possible to predict to a surprising degree the performance of children on even the arithmetic portions of the CAT based on scores from oral and written cloze tests. In 1979 Streiff replicated these findings. In both studies, proficiency in English seemed to be the major variable at play. While it makes sense to interpret the arithmetic portions of the CAT as involving a large language component, it would not make sense to say that written or oral cloze tests involve a large arithmetic component. Neither would it seem helpful to argue that a non-verbal factor, the only other competing alternative, would be a better explanation of the outcome. It is easy to see how an English language factor would come into play in taking the CAT arithmetic tests, but it is difficult to see how arithmetic or non-verbal intelligence might account for performance on a task that requires children to fill in blanks in a narrative. Streiff's results demonstrate quite clearly that language is a large factor in the comprehension and utilization of curricula presented at school.

REFERENCES

Alatis, James E. (ed.). 1980. Current issues in bilingual education: proceedings of the Georgetown round table on languages and linguistics 1980. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown.

Alderson, Charles J. 1979. The cloze procedure and proficiency in English as a foreign language. TESOL Quarterly 13.219-227.

Alderson, Charles J. 1980. Native and non-native speaker performance on cloze tests. Language Learning 30.59-76.

Amastae, Jon. 1978. Sociolinguistic background of Pan American University students. In Lozano.

Amastae, Jon. 1980. First language. In Barkin and Brandt, 14-32.

Amastae, Jon. In press a. Investigating bilingualism on the border: a review. In Barkin, Brandt, and Ornstein-Galicia.

Amastae, Jon. In press b. Language maintenance and language shift in the lower Rio Grande Valley of South Texas. Bilingual Review/ La Revista Bilingue.

Angelis, Paul. 1979. TOEFL in recent years. In Spolsky, 101-103.

Asakawa, Y. and J. W. Oller, Jr. 1977. Attitudes and attained proficiency in EFL: a sociolinguistic study of Japanese learners at the secondary level. SPEAQ Journal 1.71-80.

Bachelor, David and Donna Deyle. 1980. An ethnographic analysis of testing and the Navajo student. Albuquerque: Southwest Research Associates. (Project for the National Institute of Education.)

Bachman, Lyle F. and Adrian S. Palmer. 1980a. The construct validation of the traits "communicative competence in speaking" and "communicative competence in reading." Presented at the Fourteenth Annual TESOL Convention, San Francisco, March.

Bachman, Lyle F. and Adrian S. Palmer. 1980b. Basic concerns in test validation. Presented at the South East Asian Ministers of Education Organization RELC Fifteenth Regional Seminar, Singapore, April.

Bachman, Lyle F. and Adrian S. Palmer. 1980c. Trait and method factors in language proficiency test scores. Presented at the Language Testing Conference of the LSA/TESOL Summer Institutes, Albuquerque, June.

Barkin, Florence. 1978. Loanshifts: an example of multilingual interference. In Lozano, 1-11.

Barkin, Florence and Elizabeth Brandt (eds.). 1980. Speaking, singing, and teaching: a multidisciplinary approach to language variation. Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Southwest Areal Language and Linguistics Workshop. Anthropological Research Papers, No. 20. Tempe, Arizona: Arizona State University.

Barkin, Florence, Elizabeth Brandt, and Jacob Ornstein-Galicia. In press. Bilingualism and language contact in the borderlands. New York: Teachers College.

Benson, Pamela Cohelan and Christine Hjelt. 1980. Listening competence: a prerequisite to communication. In Oller and Perkins, 59-65.

Bjarkman, Peter C. 1980. Priorities in grading ESL composition. Presented at the LSA Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, August.

Blansitt, Edward L., Jr. and Richard V. Teschner. In press. A Festschrift for Jacob Ornstein. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Brandt, Elizabeth A. In press. A realistic agenda in Native American languages for a border linguist. In Barkin, Brandt, and Ornstein-Galicia.

Brodkey, Dean and Rodney Young. 1980a. Composition correctness scores. Presented at the Fourteenth Annual TESOL Convention, San Francisco, March.

Brodkey, Dean and Rodney Young. 1980b. Composition correctness scores. Presented at the Language Testing Conference of the LSA/TESOL Summer Institutes, Albuquerque, June.

Brooks, Bonnie S. and Dick S. Calkins. 1979. Ability and performance measures of Anglo and Mexican-American stduents at a Southwestern University. In Ornstein-Galicia and St. Clair, 55-74.

Brown, H. Douglas. 1980. The other side of the mountain: gaining a larger perspective on models of language teaching and learning. Keynote address at the Second Annual TESOL Summer Meeting, and Forum Lecture at the LSA/TESOL Summer Institutes, Albuquerque, July.

Brown, James Dean. 1980. A closer look at cloze tests. Presented at the Language Testing Conference of the LSA/TESOL Summer Institutes, Albuquerque, June.

Brunat, Silvia. 1980. Language prejudices in the Spanish for native speakers classes. Presented at the Seventh Colloquium on Hispanic Linguistics, Albuquerque, July.

Brutten, Sheila. 1980. A comparison of discrete-point and holistic measures of writing proficiency. Presented at the Second Annual TESOL Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, July.

Callaway, Donn R. 1980. Accent and the evaluation of ESL oral proficiency. In Oller and Perkins, 102-115.

Canale, Michael. 1980. A communicative approach to second language teaching and testing. Presented at the South East Asian Ministers of Education Organization RELC Fifteenth Regional Seminar, Singapore, April.

Canale, Michael and Merrill Swain. 1979. Theoretical bases of communication approaches to second language teaching and testing. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Mimeo.

Carroll, John B. 1979. Language proficiency tests developed for the IEA international study of achievement in French as a foreign language. In Spolsky, 1-48.

Carroll, John B. 1980a. Psychometric theory and language testing. Keynote address at the Language Testing Conference of the LSA/ TESOL Summer Institutes and Forum Lecture, Albuquerque, June.

Carroll, John B. 1980b. A first principal component does not necessarily indicate a g factor: remarks on Jensen's data and g factor computations. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina. Manuscript.

Cattell, R. B. and J. L. Horn. 1978. A cross-social check on the theory of fluid and crystallized intelligence with discovery of new valid subtest designs. Journal of Educational Measurement 15.139-164.

Chihara, Tetsuro and J. W. Oller, Jr. 1978. Attitudes and attained proficiency in EFL: a sociolinguistic study of adult Japanese speakers. Language Learning 28.55-68.

Chumbow, Beban. 1980. Foreign language learning: transfer and predictability of the mother tongue. Presented at the LSA Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, August.

Clark, John L. D. 1978. Psychomtetric considerations in language testing. In Spolsky, 1978a, 15-30.

Corder, S. P. 1967. The significance of learners' errors. IRAL 5.161-170.

Cohen, Andrew. 1975. A sociolinguistic approach to bilingual education. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Cummins, James. 1976. The influence of bilingualism on cognitive growth: a synthesis of research findings and explanatory hypotheses. Working Papers on Bilingualism 9.1-43.

Cummins, James. 1979a. Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age, and some other matters. Working Papers on Bilingualism 19.198-205.

Cummins, James. 1979b. Linguistic interdependence and educational development of bilingual children. Review of Educational Research 49.222-251.

Cummins, James. 1980. The construct of language proficiency in bilingual education. In Alatis.

Cummins, James. In progress. (An update on the CALP/BICS distinction: no title yet available.) In Oller.

Damico, Jack S., Gail Goldstein, Carol Wintheiser, and J. W. Oller, Jr. 1980. The structure of language proficiency in children with communicative disorders. Presented at the Language Testing Conference of the LSA/TESOL Summer Institutes, Albuquerque, June.

Damico, Jack S. and J. W. Oller, Jr. 1980. Pragmatic versus morphological/syntactic criteria for language referrals. Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools 11.85-94.

Damico, Jack S., Mary Ellen Storey, and J. W. Oller, Jr. 1980. Diagnosing language disorders in bilingual children: pragmatic versus surface oriented criteria. Presented at the Second Annual TESOL Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, July.

DeBlassie, R. R. and G. W. Healy. 1970. Self-concept: a comparison of Spanish-American, Negro, and Anglo adolescents across ethnic, sex, and socio-economic variables. Las Cruces, New Mexico: ERIC-CRESS, as cited by Walcer and Rodriguez-Brown, 1979.

Dewulf, Hilde. 1980. Dialect-interference and hypercorrection in Flemish Dutch. Presented at the LSA Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, August.

Di Pietro, Robert J. 1979. Three case studies in Italian American ethnicity and language use. In Ornstein-Galicia and St. Clair, 239-248.

Dulay, Heidi C. and Marina K. Burt. 1974. Errors and strategies in child second language acquisition. TESOL Quarterly 8.129-136.

Edelsky, Carole. 1980. How to have the floor: two general ways. Presented at the 1980 LASSO Meeting, Denver, October.

Edelsky, Carole and Sarah Hudelson. 1980. Acquiring a second language when you're not the underdog. In R. Scarcella and S. Krashen (eds.), Research in Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Elerick, Charles and Karen Ramirez. 1980. Toward a functional definition of language dominance. In Nash and Belaval, 157-177.

Erickson, Melinda. 1980. Test development: listening comprehension for engineering students. Presented at the Language Testing Conference of the LSA/TESOL Summer Institutes, Albuquerque, June.

Esau, Helmut and Annette Bristol-Plath. 1980. Contextual constraints on conversational turn-taking. Presented at the 1980 LASSO Meeting, Denver, October.

Escobar, Ana Maria. 1980. Factors influencing language choice among native Quechua-Spanish bilinguals. Presented at the Fourth Andean Linguistics Workshop, Albuquerque, August.

Evola, Jill, Ellen Mamer, and Becky Lentz. 1980. Discrete-point versus global scoring for cohesive devices. In Oller and Perkins, 177-181.

Farhady, Hossein. 1979. The disjunctive fallacy between discrete-point and integrative tests. TESOL Quarterly 13.347-358.

Farhady, Hossein. 1980a. On the plausibility of the unitary language proficiency factor. Presented at the Language Testing Conference of the LSA/TESOL Summer Institutes, Albuquerque, June.

Farhady, Hossein. 1980b. New directions for ESL proficiency testing. Presented at the Language Testing Conference of the LSA/TESOL Summer Institutes, Albuquerque, June.

Farhady, Hossein. 1980c. Justification, development, and validation of functional language testing. Unpublished UCLA doctoral dissertation.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1966. Language loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1972. The sociology of language: an inter-disciplinary social science approach to sociolinguistics. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1976. Bilingual education: an international sociological perspective. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1980. What's wrong and what's right with bilingual education. Forum Lecture presented at the LSA/TESOL Summer Institutes, Albuquerque, July.

Fishman, Joshua A. and Robert L. Cooper. 1978. The sociolinguistic foundations of language testing. In Spolsky, 1978a, 31-38.

Flahive, Douglas E. and Becky Gerlach Snow. 1980. Measures of syntactic complexity in evaluating ESL. In Oller and Perkins, 171-176.

Flanigan, Beverly Olson. 1980. Representations of American Indian English in history and literature: the evolution of a pidgin, from reality to stereotype. Presented at the Summer Meeting of the American Dialect Society, Albuquerque, July.

Fodor, Jerry A. 1975. The language of thought. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard.

Galvan, Mary. 1980. ESL: its place in the sun. Presented at the Second Annual TESOL Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, July.

Gardner, Robert C. and Wallace E. Lambert. 1972. Attitudes and motivation in second language learning. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Genesee, Fred. 1980. Bilingual brains? Presented at the Symposium on Neurolinguistics and Bilingualism, Albuquerque, July.

Godinez, Manuel, Jr. 1980. Vocalic differences between Chicano and general Californian English. Presented at the 1980 LASSO Meeting, Denver, October.

Godinez, Manual, Jr. and Mona Lindau-Webb. 1980. Closure duration of initial stop consonants: Chicano and general Californian English. Presented at the Summer Meeting of the American Dialect Society, Albuquerque, July.

Gonzales-Berry, Erlinda and Thomasina Pagán Hannum. 1980. Diagnostic testing in a Spanish for native speakers program. Presented at the Seventh Colloquium on Hispanic linguistics, Albuquerque, July.

Goodman, Kenneth S. and Yetta M. Goodman. 1978. Reading of American children whose language is a stable dialect of English or a language other than English. Fianl report; Project NIE-C-00-3-0087. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (NIE).

Gunnarsson, Bjarni. 1978. A look at the content similarities between intelligence, achievement, personality, and language test. In Oller and Perkins, 1978b, 17-35.

Guntermann, Gail. 1978. A study of the frequency and communicative effects of errors in Spanish. Modern Language Journal 62.249-253.

Halliday, Michael A. K. 1980. It's a fixed word order language is English. Forum lecture presented at the LSA/TESOL Summer Institutes, Albuquerque, July.

Haugen, Einar. 1980. Personal reflections on growing up bilingual. In Ornstein-Galicia and St. Clair, 249-262.

Higurashi, Yoshiko and Charles McClenon. 1980. Native Japanese treatment of the English l/r distinction. Presented at the LSA Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, August.

Hinofotis, Frances. 1980a. More on assessing competence in an educational environment. Presented at the Language Testing Conference of the LSA/TESOL Summer Institutes, Albuquerque, June.

Hinofotis, Frances and Becky Gerlach Snow. 1980. An alternative cloze testing procedure: multiple-choice format. In Oller and Perkins, 129-133.

Hirvonen, Tuula. 1980. Linguistic complexity vs. cognitive development in bilingual language acquisition. Presented at the LSA Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, August.

Hoffer, Bates. 1980a. Syntactic complexity revisited. San Antonio, Texas. Unpublished paper; Trinity University.

Hoffer, Bates. 1980b. Native American dialects of English: the Alabama-Coushatta Reservation. Presented at the American Dialect Society Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, July.

Hoffer, Bates. 1980c. Reading development and the maturation of language. Presented at the 1980 LASSO Meeting, Denver, October.

Homer, Susan and Peggy Lazarus. 1980. Sharing-time in kindergarten: a study of the relationship between structure and content. Presented at the 1980 LASSO meeting, Denver, October.

Hudson-Edwards, Alan, Carlos Astiz, and David Lopez. 1979. Bilingual election services. Volume III: a state of the art report. Washington, D. C.: National Clearinghouse on Election Administration.

Hudson-Edwards, Alan and Garland D. Bills. In press. Intergenerational language shift in an Albuquerque barrio. In Blansitt and Teschner.

Huerta, Ana. 1980. Code switching among Spanish-English bilinguals: a descriptive study. In Nash and Belaval, 206-231.

Hulstijn, Jan H. 1980. Variability in interlanguage and conditions on monitor use. Presented at the Second Annual TESOL Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, July.

Hunt, Kellogg. 1965. Grammatical structures written at three grade levels. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Hymes, Dell, and W. E. Bittle, (eds.). 1967. Studies in Southwestern ethnolinguistics. The Hague: Mouton.

Ilyin, Donna and Cecelia Doherty. 1980. Can multiple choice cloze reading tests substitute for listening and/or structure tests used for immigrant students in adult open enrollment English/Second Language classes? Presented at the Second Annual TESOL Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, July.

Ingram, Elisabeth. 1978. The psycholinguistic basis. In Spolsky, 1978a, 1-14.

Jacobs, Holly L. and Stephen Zinkgraf. 1980. Reliability and validity of the ESL composition ability profile (ECAP). Presented at the Fourteenth Annual International TESOL Convention, San Francisco, March.

Jacobson, Rodolfo. 1978a. Code switching in South Texas: sociolinguistic considerations and pedagogical applications. Journal of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest 3.20-33.

Jacobson, Rodolfo. 1978b. Anticipatory embedding and imaginary content: two newly identified code switching variables. In Lozano, 16-26.

Jakobovits, L. 1970. Foreign Language Learning. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Johansson, Stig. 1973. An evaluation of the noise test: a method for testing overall second language proficiency by perception under masking noise. IRAL 2.109-133.

John-Steiner, Vera. 1980. The road to competence in an alien land: A Vygotskyan perspective on bilingualism. An invited paper presented at the Vygotsky Conference at the Center for Psychosocial Studies, Chicago, October.

John-Steiner, Vera. In press. The interactionist model of language development. In B. Bain (ed.), Sociogenesis of language and human conduct: a multidisciplinary book of readings. New York: Plenum.

Johnson, Jane and Ralph E. Cooley. 1980. Suprasegmentals in Indian English. Presented at the LSA Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, August.

Johnson, Jerrilou. 1980. Using the affective domain in the ESL classroom. Presented at the Fourteenth Annual TESOL Convention, San Francisco, March.

Johnson, Thomas Ray and Kathy Krug. 1980. Integrative and instrumental motivations: in search of a measure. In Oller and Perkins, 241-249.

Johnston, Susan Sullivan and Jean Zukowski Faust. 1980. Composition testing: how to be objective. Presented at the Fourteenth Annual TESOL Convention, San Francisco, March.

Jones, Randall. 1979. The oral interview of the Foreign Service Institute. In Spolsky, 104-115.

Jonz, Jon. 1976. Improving on the basic egg: the multiple choice cloze test. Language Learning, 26.255-265.

Jonz, Jon. 1980. Syntactic, semantic and psychometric parameters of the M-C cloze. Presented at the Language Testing Conference of the LSA/TESOL Summer Institutes, Albuquerque, June.

Jöreskog, K. G. 1969. A general approach to confirmatory maximum likelihood factor analysis. Psychometrika 34.183-202.

Kaczmarek, Celeste M. 1980. Scoring and rating essay tasks. In Oller and Perkins, 151-159.

Kessler, Carolyn, David C. Harrison, and Curtis W. Hayes. 1979. Testing the language intake hypothesis: aspects of discourse analysis. Presented at the Thirteenth Annual TESOL Convention, Boston March.

Kessler, Carolyn and Mary Ellen Quinn. 1980. Bilingualism and science problem-solving ability. Bilingual Education Paper, Series 4-1. Los Angeles: California State University, National Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Krashen, Stephen. 1976. Formal and informal linguistic environments in language learning and language acquisition. TESOL Quarterly 10.157-168.

Krashen, Stephen. 1978. Individual variation in the use of the monitor. In W. C. Ritchie (ed.), Second Language Acquisition Research: Issues and Implications. New York: Academic Press, 175-183.

Krashen, Stephen. 1980a. The input hypothesis. In Alatis.

Krashen, Stephen. 1980b. Second language acquisition and the monitor model. Forum lecture presented at the LSA/TESOL Summer Insitutes, Albuquerque, July.

Krashen, Stephen. In press. Second language acquisition and second language learning. London: Pergamon.

Leap, William F. 1980. Cleft and pseudo-cleft in Tewa English. In Barkin and Brandt, 179-191.

Leutke-Stahlman, B. 1980. Similarities in the field of hearing impairment and bilingual education. Presented at the Fourth Annual Symposium on Spanish and Portuguese Bilingualism, Juarez, Mexico, November.

Lewis, E. Glynn. 1979. The IEA international study of achievement test of proficiency in English as a foreign language. In Spolsky, 49-91.

Lindenfeld, Jacqueline and Lucila Carrasco-Schoch. 1979. Psychological aspects of bilingualism and biculturalism in Mexican-American children. In Ornstein-Galicia and St. Clair, 39-54.

Lipski, John. 1980. A fuzzy model of bilingual competence. Presented at the Fourth Annual Symposium on Spanish and Portuguese Bilingualism, Juarez, Mexico, November.

Loban, W. 1976. Lanugage development. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Lozano, Anthony (ed.). 1978. Bilingual and biliterate perspectives. Proceedings of the Seventh Southwest Areal Lanugage and Linguistics Workshop. Boulder: University of Colorado.

Luján, Marta and Liliana Minaya. 1980. Language acquisition in a bilingual context. Presented at the Fourth Annual Symposium on Spanish and Portuguese Bilingualism, Juarez, Mexico, November.

Madsen, Harold and Mary Lee Scott. 1980. Affect: a third dimension in second-language test evaluation. Presented at the Language Testing Conference of the LSA/TESOL Summer Institutes, Albuquerque, June.

Maureira, Magda. 1980. Age as a factor in the SNS classroom: pedagogical implications. Presented at the Fourth Annual Symposium on Spanish and Portuguese Bilingualism, Juarez, Mexico, November.

McQuade, Judy. 1980. Factors affecting the composition performance of PAU students. In Barkin and Brandt, 227-234.

Molloy, Josette. 1980. ESP test development: reading comprehension for engineering students. Presented at the Language Testing Conference of the LSA/TESOL Summer Institutes, Albuquerque, June.

Muchisky, Dennis, Sharon Fujinaka, and Martha Furch. 1980. Sociolinguistic aspects of communicative competence. Presented at the Fourteenth Annual TESOL Convention, San Francisco, March.

Mullen, Karen A. 1980. Evaluating language proficiency in ESL. In Oller and Perkins, 160-169.

Nash, R. and D. Belaval (eds.). 1980. Readings in Spanish/English Contrastive Linguistics, Volume II. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Inter American University.

Natalicio, Diana. 1979. Reading and the bilinual child. In L. Resnick and P. Weaver (eds.), Theory and practice of early reading. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Newman, Stanley. 1954. American Indian linguistics in the Southwest. American Anthropologist 56.626-634.

Ney, James W. 1979. In support of the two stage language acquisition hypothesis. Presented at the Thirteenth Annual TESOL Convention, Boston, March.

Nunnally, Jim C. 1967. Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw Hill.

Obler, Loraine. 1980. Individual differences in cerebral lateralization in bilinguals. Presented at the Symposium on Neurolinguistics and Bilingualism, Albuquerque, July.

Odlin, Terence and Diana Natalicio. 1980. Lexical class identifications in L_1 and L_2. Presented at the Fourteenth Annual TESOL Convention, San Francisco, March.

Oller,John W., Jr. 1976. The measurement of bilingualism: a review. Modern Language Journal 60.399-400.

Oller,John W., Jr. 1978a. How important is language proficiency to IQ and other educational tests? In Oller and Perkins, 1978b. 1-16.

Oller,John W., Jr. 1978b. Pragmatics and language testing. In Spolsky, 1978a, 39-58.

Oller,John W., Jr. 1979. Language tests at school: a pragmatic approach. London: Longman.

Oller,John W., Jr. 1980a. A language factor deeper than speech: more data and theory for bilingual assessment. In Alatis.

Oller,John W., Jr. 1980b. Research on the measurement of affective variables: some remaining questions. In R. Andersen (ed.), New Dimensions in Second Language Acquisition Research. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House. 1980.

Oller,John W., Jr. (ed.). In progress. Issues in language testing research. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico. Manuscript.

Oller,John W., Jr., Lori Baca, and Fred Vigil. 1977. Attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL: a sociolinguistic study of Mexican-Americans in the Southwest. TESOL Quarterly 11.173-183.

Oller,John W., Jr. and Frances B. Hinofotis. 1980. Two mutually exclusive hypotheses about second language ability: indivisible or partially divisible competence. In Oller and Perkins, 13-23.

Oller,John W., Jr., Alan J. Hudson, and Phyllis Fei Liu. 1977. Attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL: a sociolinguistic study of native speakers of Chinese in the United States. Language Learning 27. 1-27.

Oller,John W., Jr. and Kyle Perkins. 1978a. Intelligence and language proficiency as sources of variance in self-reported affective variables. Language Learning 28.85-97.

Oller,John W., Jr. and Kyle Perkins (eds.). 1978b. Language in education: testing the tests. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Oller,John W., Jr. and Kyle Perkins. 1978c. Language proficiency as a source of variance in self-reported affective variables. In Oller and Perkins, 1978b, 103-125.

Oller,John W., Jr. and Kyle Perkins. 1979. A further comment on language proficiency as a source of variance in certain affective measures. Language Learning 28.417-423.

Oller,John W., Jr. and Kyle Perkins (eds.). 1980. Research in language testing. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Oller,John W., Jr., Kyle Perkins, and Murakami Mitsuhisa. 1980. Seven types of learner variables in relation to ESL learning. In Oller and Perkins, 233-240.

Oller,John W., Jr. and Bernard Spolsky. 1979. The test of English as a foreign language (TOEFL). In Spolsky, 92-100.

Oller,John W., Jr. and Virginia Streiff. In press. The langauge factor: more tests of tests. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Ornstein, Jacob. 1973. Toward an inventory of interdisciplinary tasks in research on U.S. Southwest bilingualism/biculturalism. In Turner, 321-339.

Ornstein-Galicia, Jacob. 1980. Homogeneity of phonological/grammatical variants of Mexican-American English in a five state area. Presented at the Summer Meeting of the American Dialect Society, Albuquerque, July.

Ornstein-Galicia, Jacob and R. St. Clair (eds.). 1979. Bilingual and bicultural education: new readings and insights. San Antonio, Texas: Trinity University.

Orr, Margaret. 1980. Some conideration in the language assessment of bilingual Chicano children: a pilot study. In Barkin and Brandt, 42-49.

Ortiz, Leroy I. 1980. Language maintenance in Arroyo Seco, New Mexico. Presented at the Seventh Colloquium on Hispanic Linguistics, Albuquerque, July.

Padilla, Amado M. 1980a. Language organization in bilingual memory. Presented at the Symposium on Neurolinguistics and Bilingualism, Albuquerque, July.

Padilla, Amado M. 1980b. Acquisition in Spanish-English bilingual children. Presented at the Seventh Colloquium on Hispanic Linguistics, Albuquerque, July.

Paradis, Michel. 1980. Models of possible neurolinguistic organization of a bilingual's two languages. Presented at the Symposium on Neurolinguistics and Bilingualism, Albuquerque, July.

Porch, Bruce. 1980. Multidimensional quantification and language processing. Presented at the Language Testing Conference of the LSA/ TESOL Summer Institutes, Albuquerque, June.

Porter, Don. 1979. Cloze procedure and equivalence. Language Learning 28.333-341.

Prapphal, Kanchana. In progress. Reading acquisition: getting the filters down for Thai students. University of New Mexico doctoral dissertation in progress.

Preston, Dennis 1980. The ethnography of TESOL. Presented at the Second Annual TESOL Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, July.

Purcell, Edward T. 1980. Models of pronunciation accuracy. Presented at the Language Testing Conference of the LSA/TESOL Summer Institutes, Albuquerque, June.

Read,John. 1980. Toward a comprehensive framework for the analysis of American Indian language maintenance and language shift. In Barkin and Brandt, 224-225.

Reyes-Hailey, Celia. 1980. First things first: the effect of L1 development on L2 vocabulary acquisition. Presented at the LSA Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, August.

Richards, Jack. 1980. Conversation: what it is and what it isn't. Presented at the 2nd Annual TESOL Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, July (to appear in TESOL Quarterly).

Rogers, Sarah and Michael Haltresht. 1980. Reading English as a second language: a synopsis of activities. In Barkin and Brandt, 316-323.

Rosansky, Ellen S. 1979. A review of the Bilingual Syntax Measure. In Spolsky, 116-135.

Rosier, Paul. 1979. A comparative study of two approaches of introducing initial reading to Navajo children: the direct method and the native-language method. In Outstanding Dissertations in Bilingual Education. Rosslyn, Virginia: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Rosier, Paul and Marilyn Farella. 1976. Bilingual education at Rock Point; some early results. TESOL Quarterly 10.379-388.

Rosier, Paul and Wayne Holm. 1980. The Rock Point experience: a longitudinal study of a Navajo school program (Saad Naaki Bee Na'nitin). Papers in Applied Linguistics: Bilingual Education Series 8. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Ryan, Marie-Laure. 1980. Fom verbal play to verbal art: on the language strategies of everyday conversation. Presented at the 1980 LASSO meeting, Denver, October.

St. Clair, Robert N. and Jacob Ornstein-Galicia. 1979. Interdisciplinary linguistics and bilingualism. In Ornstein-Galicia and St. Clair, 311-322.

Sadek, Carmen Sánchez. 1980. Developing writing skills: adult bilingual speakers' code-switching patterns. Presented at the Seventh Colloquium on Hispanic Linguistics, Albuquerque, July.

Sampson, Gloria Paulik. 1980a. A functional approach to second language learning. Presented at the Second Annual TESOL Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, July.

Sampson, Gloria Paulik. 1980b. The languages of Cree children: development and dissolution. Presented at the Second Annual TESOL Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, July.

Sánchez, Rosaura. 1980. Chicano code-switching. Presented at the Seventh Colloquium on Hispanic Lingusitics, Albuquerque, July.

Schnitzer, Marc. 1980. A case grammar approach to Spanish-English contrastive analysis. In Nash and Belaval, 3-40.

Scholz, George, Debbie Hendricks, Randon Spurling, Marianne Johnson, and Lela Vandenburg. 1980. Is language ability divisible or unitary? A factor analysis of 22 English language proficiency tests. In Oller and Perkins, 24-33.

Schumann, John. 1978. The pidginization hypothesis. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Scott, Robert. 1979. Measure of adult English proficiency: final technical report, volume II, technical narrative. Austin, Texas: Resource Development Institute.

Seely, Jonathon. 1980. Merry Christmas from Mohamed, with sympathy. Presented at the Fourteenth Annual TESOL Convention, San Francisco, March.

Seymour, Sharon. 1980. Short term teacher-training program for adult ESL instructors. Presented at the Second Annual TESOL Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, July.

Shohamy, Elana, 1979. Inter-rater and intra-rater reliability of the oral interview and concurrent validity with cloze procedure in Hebrew. Presented at the Colloquium on the Validation of Oral Proficiency Tests at the Thirteenth TESOL Convention, Boston, March.

Shuldberg, Howard Kelly. 1980. An examination of the importance of focus on form for second language monitoring. Presented at the Second Annual TESOL Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, July.

Slobin, D. J. 1974. Psycholinguistics. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman.

Smith, Frank. 1973. Psycholinguistics and reading. New York: Holt.

Smith, Frank. In press. Writing. New York: Holt.

Soares, A. T., and T. M. Soares. 1969. Self perceptions of culturally disadvantaged children. American Educational Research Journal 6.31-45.

Sobin, Nicholas. 1977. English Syntax Questionnaire. Edinburg, Texas: Pan American University. Manuscript.

Sobin, Nicholas. 1978. On complex sentence construction. In Lozano, 112-122.

Sobin, Nicholas. 1980. On transference and inversion. In Blansitt and Teschner.

Solé, Yolanda. 1979. Hispanic organizational interest in language maintenance. LASSO Journal 3.123-132.

Spolsky, Bernard (ed.). 1978a. Advances in language testing, series: 2, approaches to language testing. Papers in Applied Linguistics. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Spolsky, Bernard (ed.). 1978b. Linguistics and language testers. In Spolsky, 1978a, ii - x.

Spolsky, Bernard (ed.) 1979. Advances in language testing, series: 1, some major tests. Papers in Applied Linguistics. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Spolsky, Bernard. 1980. Toward a sociolinguistics of literacy. Forum Lecture presented at the LSA/TESOL Summer Institutes, Albuquerque, July.

Spolsky, Bernard and Patricia Irvine, 1980. Sociolinguistic aspects of literacy in the vernacular. In Barkin and Brandt, 246-251.

Spolsky, Bernard, Guillermina Englebrecht, and Paticia Irvine. In progress. Sociolinguistics of literacy: an historical and comparative study. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico. (NIE funded project.)

Stahl, Robert. 1980. The domain of cognition: a functional model of learning appropriate for language, semantics, and psycholinguistic research, teaching and evaluation. In Barkin and Brandt, 275-294.

Streiff, Viginia. 1978. Relationships among oral and written cloze scores and achievement test scores in a bilingual setting. In Oller and Perkins, 1978b, 65-104.

Streiff, Virginia. 1979. Another look at the English language factor in educational tests for bilinguals. Presented at the Thirteenth Annual TESOL Convention, Boston, March, 1979.

Streiff, Virginia. 1980a. The role of language in educational test performance. Presented at the Language Testing Conference of the LSA/TESOL Summer Institutes, Albuquerque, June.

Streiff, Virginia. 1980b. Cloze in the classroom. Presented at the Fourteenth Annual TESOL Convention, San Francisco, March.

Stump, Thomas A. 1978. Cloze and dictation tasks as predictors of intelligence and achievement scores. In Oller and Perkins, 1978b, 36-64.

Swain, Merrill. 1980. Time and timing in bilingual education. Forum Lecture presented at the LSA/TESOLSummer Institutes, Albuquerque, July.

Troike, Rudolph. 1980. On integrating meaning in language and culture: toward a program for linguistics in the 1980's. In Barkin and Brandt, 5-11.

Turner, Paul. 1973. Bilingualism in the Southwest. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona.

Upshur, John A. 1980. Some language test relations at successive ability levels. Presented at the Second International Language Testing Symposium, Darmstadt, Germany, May.

Upshur, John A., William Acton, Bradford Arthur, and Alexander Z. Guiora. 1978. Causation or correlation: a reply to Oller and Perkins. Language Learning 28.99-104.

Upshur, John A. and T. J. Homburg. In progress. Some language test relations at successive ability levels. In Oller.

Valdés, Guadalupe and Cecilia Pino. 1980. Muy a tus ordenes: compliment responses among Mexican-American bilinguals. In Barkin and Brandt, 1980. 337-357.

Vygotsky, L. S. 1978. Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes. Michael Cole, Vera John-Steiner, Sylvia Scribner, and Ellen Souberman (eds.). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard.

Walcer, Carol and Flora V. Rodriguez-Brown. 1979. Social and psychological aspects of language use by bilingual children. In Ornstein-Galicia and St. Clair, 17-38.

Wang, William S-Y. 1980. Bilinguals and perception. Presented at the Symposium on Neurolinguistics and Bilingualism, Albuquerque, July.

Warner, Brian. 1980. Description of bilingual speech. In Barkin and Brandt, 358-368.

Weissberg, Robert G. and Stephen S. Farmer. 1980. Communicative disorders in the ESL classroom. Presented at the Fourteenth Annual TESOL Convention, San Francisco, March.

Widgorsky, Leopoldo. 1980. Fatigue and language performance. Presented at the LSA Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, August.

Wukasch, Charles. 1980. Staging Shakespeare in an EFL program. Presented at the Second Annual TESOL Summer Meeting, Albuquerque, July.

Yorozuya, Ryuichi and J. W. Oller, Jr. 1980. Oral proficiency scales: construct validity and the halo effect. Language Learning 30. 135-154.

Young, Rodney. 1979. A hierarchical approach to measures of language proficiency. In Ornstein-Galicia and St. Clair, 77-94.

Zirkel, P. 1971. Self concept and the "disadvantage" of ethnic group membership. Review of Eucational Research 41.211-225.

CONFERENCE REPORTS

Report On Language Attrition Conference, University of Pennsylvania, by Barbara Freed and Richard D. Lambert (University of Pennsylvania)

A conference on the Attrition of Language Skills was held May 2 and 3, 1980 at the University of Pennsylvania. It was attended by some 60 participants drawn from among academics working on this and related topics, government officials concerned with language policy, and representatives of language-relevant organizations. The purpose of the conference was to explore: (1) what is known from the scanty literature dealing directly with language skill loss; (2) what useful insights can be drawn from the relevant subfields of linguistics and language pedagogy; (3) what kinds of research and experimentation need to be undertaken and how they should be conducted; and (4) what policy decisions are affected and what purposes and clienteles are to be served.

The conference was divided into three major sessions: Theoretical Aspects of Psycholinguistics and Sociolinguistics with Special Relevance to Language Loss; The Description and Measurement of Language Loss; and Language Loss and Maintenance: Implications for Programs and Policy.

The first session, chaired by Lila Gleitman (Department of Psychology, University of Pennsylvania) consisted of papers which reviewed existing domains of research and extrapolated possible hypotheses and research strategies for the study of language skill attrition. Jean Berko-Gleason (Department of Psychology, Boston University) reviewed the literature on child language acquisition with particular reference to second language loss. She proposed that language acquisition studies can provide suggestions as to what linguistic features might be most vulnerable to loss and which may be more robust. She suggested that among language skills items learned separately may be differentially affected, that other distinguishing features such as first learned, best learned may have varying rates of loss. She indicated that while there are some universals in language acquisition there may be great individual variation in either acquisition or attrition from such characteristics as differences in content and style of linguistic input, cognitive styles, sex differences, the likelihood of spontaneous rehearsal, and various speaker characteristics. In addition, specific language sub-systems might be differentially affected, whether the traditional sub-systems of phonology, morphology, syntax and vocabulary or such specialized aspects as routines, sequences, songs, registers, and emotion-laden words.

R.C. Gardner (Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario) proposed that we consider language attrition as part of the

general phenomenon of language change. He stressed that he preferred to emphasize retention rather than loss, although the two were obviously two ends of a continuum. This led him to propose as a hypothesis that those classes of variables which reflect a willingness to make use of the language in various social situations would also predict retention. Drawing on work done on bilingualism in Canada, he stressed the importance of learners' attitudes toward another language and its speakers and urged that we expand our focus to include the loss of first language skills.

Nancy Dorian (Department of German, Bryn Mawr College) the third speaker in this session, drew upon her own field research on speakers of East Sutherland Gaelic, a language in the process of becoming extinct. She cautioned that language contact did not automatically mean language loss. She urged that part of our focus be on the changes in languages as a whole, as well as the language behavior of individual speakers. She, too, stressed the importance of the relative prestige of contact languages, although she indicated that her case studies emphasized the role of individual differences in response. In support of this point she cited three very different response patterns among subjects who had been removed from a native speaking setting for a long period of time. Differences in performance that were interpreted by the community on the single dimension of language loyalty were strongly affected by a variety of idiosyncratic elements of speaker response.

Loraine Obler (Department of Neurology, Boston University School of Medicine and Aphasia Research Center) discussed the neurological aspects of language loss, particularly Aphasia and the consequences of aging. She pointed out that naming is the most universally impaired skill in aphasia—especially content words as opposed to functors and nouns rather than verbs. Those that seem to remain are over-learned items like colors, numbers, letters, counting, cursing and emotion-laden words. Except for these, studies of the location of lesions in aphasia and consequent language deficiencies point to the different reactions depending upon which part of the brain is damaged. For example, Broca's aphasia damages speech production rather than comprehension and functors rather than substantics while in Wernicke's aphasia the converse is true. Of special interest are polyglot asphasics where some aphasic individuals show different losses in each language and for others the same type of loss. Among the healthy aged, naming and comprehension seem the most readily impaired features with syntax and phonology remaining fairly constant. Obler provided pedagogical strategies for rejuvenating of lost language skills which are drawn from aphasic therapy.

During the discussion following this session questions were raised about nomenclature—for instance whether attrition was a confusing term in that it often refers to a contraction in the number of qualified speakers

rather than a loss of skill. A topic of concern was the general focus and scope of the language attrition project—whether it would be more efficient to broaden the frame of reference to include all language change or concentrate on skill loss with a heavy emphasis on the loss of classroom learned second languages. Participants added to the list of predicter variables which might be important to language skill retention—a general sense of language structure and usage, high verbal skills, reading competency, strong institutional support, the tendency to soliloquize when alone, and periodic reinforcement.

The second sesssion, chaired by Richard Tucker (Center for Applied Linguistics) focused upon the design of research specifically directed to the study of language skill attrition. Roger Andersen (Department of English at the University of California at Los Angeles) argued for a broader perspective of treating language attrition as a special case of language acquisition and use. He proposed that we start with the formulation that reduction in linguistic form and individual repertoire is occasioned by restrictions in use and a break in linguistic tradition. We should measure linguistic deficiencies against the benchmark of the fully competent speaker. Reviewing the literature on the loss of particular features, he presented a series of propositions about deficiencies which would arise in lexicon, phonology, morphology and syntax and he outlined some of the compensating strategies commonly used to cope with these deficiencies.

Rebecca Oxford (InterAmerica Research Associates) described the pros and cons of various research styles: descriptive, quasi-experimental and experimental. She explored questions of measurement dealing with the criterion variable, distinguishing integrative from discrete point and direct versus indirect measures, and problems of realiability and validity. She suggested several potential cohorts for future study, and proposed that we should develop from the beginning a meta-analysis into which the various research ventures might fit.

John Clark (Educational Testing Service) also urged that we consider our research domain to include all of language change and not just language attrition. He stressed an emphasis on individuals' performance in a second language. In measuring the criterion variable, he argued that we need both general proficiency and diagnostic feedback measures, the latter focused on specific linguistic features and aspects of language performance, and the former on measures of global skill calibrated to real life behavior. After examining existing tests he concluded that none of the existing measurement devices will serve and that fresh measurement devices will have to be devised. Desiderata in new test construction were discussed and he urged that any major variable be measured by two or three measurement techniques. He discussed the need to develop a uniform set of instruments to measure the predictor variables and agree

upon an overall model for research so that the separate studies would be both comparable and additive.

Discussion following these presentations focused on operating definitions and measurement of skills in language attrition. Roger Andersen's use of LD "Language Deficient" was questioned as an appropriate term for individuals with language loss, since LD is widely used in the literature to signify "language delayed." Several alternative suggestions were made: classify individuals as language competent or non-language competent; use native vs. fluent vs. diminished ability; or use LB—language benchmark— as the point where an individual reached his or her highest level of proficiency. There was general agreement that a study of language attrition not be restricted to those individuals who begin with full language competency. Different beginning levels of proficiency need to be assessed for each language skill. Once aptitude, attitude, achievement and cognitive style baseline information is gathered for target groups, one can try to make qualitative and quantitative predictions about the course of language attrition with regard to various hypotheses. One would want to look for a possible sequence of loss, to see if there are points at which certain language items change vis-a-vis others. A possible source of comparison might be data from CIA language files which provide lists of common errors which differentiate individuals at various levels of proficiency.

The need for a common metric in language attrition research was emphasized in later discussions. For example, FSI ratings do not correlate with end-of-the-term "proficiency" in high school or college courses. A decision must also be made with regard to the specific skills to be tested. While some members stressed testing of oral proficiency alone others preferred testing for knowledge of syntax, phonology and lexicon. There was general agreement that research must involve two target populations, consisting of English-speaking natives learning second languages and those whose mother tongue is not English and who are losing first language skills as a result of a switch to English.

Richard Tucker summarized the discussion by sketching in some of the data which needs to be collected in a systematic fashion: (1) the amount and rate of change; (2) what individuals bring to the learning situation; (3) what type of training was given; (4) the passage of time; (5) intervening language-relevant activities; (6) language proficiency in terms of separate skills and global ratings and both as a criterion and predictor variable.

Richard Thompson (Department of Education) chaired the final session which dealt with the policy implications of language attrition research. Albert Valdman (Indiana University) noted that in spite of the potential relevance of language attrition studies to the administration of

foreign language instruction, almost no attention had been yet paid to this subject. He discussed its possible relevance for: the selection of curricula and course syllabi, especially the establishment of sequential instruction; the preparation of materials; and the refinement of instructional procedures. Examples of the implications of language skill attrition research for these aspects of foreign language instruction were given from French courses at Indiana University and the Scott-Foresman French sequential series. A cyclical model of presentation with a special focus on reinforcement and retentionwas recommended.

Pardee Lowe (Central Intelligence Agency) reviewed recent developments in several government language programs. He discussed the usefulness for these analyses of a variety of data on language-skilled government employees. The FSI ratings given an approximate general metric against which other measures are calibrated. Speaking and reading skills are measured throughout the government while separate comprehension and listening scores are given by the intelligence agencies. Lowe traced an imaginary student through the various training options and materials available to government employees. He reported on a small pilot study which indicated that skills are lost in the following order: speaking, understanding, and reading. Loss rates are language specific. He discussed a number of limitations that severely circumscribed the usefulness of most data files on government employees for studies of language skill attrition.

Jack Levy (U.S. Office of Bilingual Education) urged that emphasis be placed on the loss of first language skills by ethno-linguistic minorities in ultimate studies. The current debates about additive and subtractive bilingual policy make this highly relevant.

The relevance of language attrition research for the development of a comprehensive, rational language policy was discussed by Richard Thompson. In addition, some specific questions were raised about existing training and support programs. It was asked whether the government should establish refresher and maintenace programs for language-relevant positions and, if so, at what intervals, where and how; a special effort should be made to maintain existing stocks of language competencies; what role can be played by federally funded summer programs and overseas language training centers; how much of the skill in scarce languages produced with the help of NDEA VI is viable today? Thompson urged that we make our work not only theoretical, but oriented toward practical solutions for practical problems.

Richard Thompson's presentation prompted questions and responses about the availability of published materials for language use in retention. While several courses of study are available none has design features which address retention per se. FSI has a programmatic course in Spanish which is a self-paced set of materials for a refresher course. The

National Association of Self-Instructive Language offers texts to be used in the field without teachers. A current Russian maintenance program at Ohio State was mentioned. The University of Pennsylvania is offering an experimental French course to revive lost linguistic skills to those who had previously studied French.

There was agreement at the conclusion of the conference that a new and potentially major subfield in linguistics and language pedagogy has been discussed. A series of task forces was created to carry forward planning and research. They include groups to work on the following:

1) specification of predictor and criterion variables and the development of standardized instruments for measuring them.
2) individual aspects of language learning and forgetting, general psycholinguistic research.
3) language "death" as in Gaelic speaking communities or major change as in pidginization.
4) bilingualism and language skill loss related to bilingualism among immigrant groups in the U.S.
5) research in instructional and materials design.

Those who wish additional information on the conference of the Language Skill Attrition Project can obtain information from the Project Directors, Richard D. Lambert and Barbara Freed at the University of Pennsylvania.

Report on the Regional Seminar on Evaluation and Measurement of Language Competence and Performance, by Teodoro A. Llamzon (RELC, Singapore)

The sixteenth in the series of regional seminars held under the auspices of the Regional Language Centre (RELC) of the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO) took place April 21-25, 1980.

The Seminar attracted a number of well-known scholars in the field of language testing, senior Ministry of Education officials, curriculum development officers, teacher educators, educational planners and language teachers. Some 400 participants from 22 countries attended. There were six plenary and 28 parallel sessions at which 39 papers were read and discussed. In addition, there were 12 workshops, which made possible in depth discussions of certain topics of interest to the participants. Finally, there were three panel discussions, which were organized to give both the outstanding scholars present at the seminar and the participants more opportunities to exchange views on basic issues and current developments in language testing.

This report will focus mainly on the papers presented at the plenary sessions, but will try to enumerate the various topics covered at both the parallel sessions and the panel discussions.

The first plenary session was entitled New Directions in Linguistics and Their Influence on Language Testing Theory and Practice. John W. Oller, Jr. (USA) started this session with a paper on "Pragmatics and Language Testing," in which he stressed the necessity of using test procedures which contextualized structures or vocabulary items so as to ensure that the testees were not subjected to tests based on the meaningless use of language. He discussed the pragmatic naturalness constraints of such types of tests as dictation, composition, cloze, oral interview, elicited imitation, imperatives and the like.

The second paper was entitled "Towards a Theory of Language Test Validation" by Teresita Rafael (Philippines), and argued that "construct validity" gave a better indication of a test's validity than the so-called "psychometric-structuralist testing," because the test measured logically and precisely certain behaviors, given the context and the principles underlying the said behaviors. In effect, construct validity was an index of the meaningfulness of the test as well as the theory underlying the test.

Adrian Palmer (USA) in "Basic Concepts in Test Validation" explained that because test developers rarely provided evidence for the four types of validity (face, content, criterion referenced, and construct), test users frequently accepted evidence of one type of validity as evidence of validity in general. He then argued that construct validity was more defensible in principle than the other types, even though it was also the most difficult to provide evidence for, and to understand.

There followed two parallel sessions in which four papers were read at each session. A wide range of topics were discussed. Francis C. Johnson and Christina Wong Leung Kin-Ling (Hong Kong) presented a paper entitled, "The Interdependence of Teaching, Testing and Instructional Materials." David Zorc (Australia) read a paper on "Literacy Competence Testing." Azman Wan Chik (Malaysia) described "Testing Competence and Performance in Bahasa Malaysia: Listening Comprehension," while Nahm-Sheik Park informed the seminar participants of "Language Testing in Korea." In the second parallel session, Arthur Godman (UK) discussed "Purposeful Testing of Language Competence"; Angela Fok Chan Yuen Yuen (Hong Kong), "Testing Listening Proficiency at the Tertiary Level"; Robert Litteral (Papua New Guinea), "Discourse Factors in the Evaluation of Language Ability"; and Milagros D. Ibe (Philippines), "Language Test Analysis Beyond the Validity and Reliability Criteria."

The theme of the third plenary session was Testing Communicative Competence. Peter J.M. Groot (Holland) started this session by discussing his paper "Testing Communicative Competence." After a brief review of the various types of tests, and tracing the origin of the concept of communicative competence, he attempted to enumerate its various

components, namely linguistic (knowledge of the syntactic, lexical and phonological aspects of the target language), sociolinguistic (knowledge of its rules of discourse, contextual appropriateness, etc.) and psycholinguistic (making use of verbal and non-verbal communicative strategies). He then argued that such a breakdown of the concept was essential for a principled construction of reliable and (content) valid test of communicative competence.

In "A Test of Communicative Competence in Pilipino," Emma Castillo (Philippines) described a project to develop a test of communicative competence in Pilipino for prospective elementary school teachers, based on an integrated psycho-sociolinguistic theory of language. The validity of the test was assessed by the use of the point-biserial correlation formula; its predictive validity, by a multiple correlation of Parts I and II with the grade point average, together with a multiple regression equation.

The third session of parallel sessions was devoted to procedures for testing communicative competence. Frances B. Hinofotis (USA) presented a paper on "Communicative Competence in an Educational Environment"; Rahayu Hidayat (Indonesia), on "Cloze Test as a Measure of Communicative Competence"; Lee Yick Pang (Hong Kong) on "The Evaluation and Measurement of Communicative Competence"; and Graeme D. Kennedy (New Zealand) on "Performance Variability and Listening Proficiency."

The fourth plenary session was a continuation of the third with W. Michael Canale (Canada) describing A Communicative Approach to Second Language Teaching and Testing. The paper first proposed a theoretical framework for communicative competence and then presented a set of guidelines for language teaching and testing communicative competence at the elementary and secondary grade levels. Finally, it provided a general outline of the areas of communication skills and evaluation criteria based on the recent research work by John Munby and Keith Morrow and on the preliminary findings of the project "French as a Second Language: Ontario Assessment Instrument Pool Project."

There were three panel discussions organized to provide a forum for exchange of views on issues and current developments. The first panel discussion considered the topic Testing Communicative Competence; the second, Testing of Reading and Writing; and the third, Current Testing Practices and Problems. Written questions were submitted beforehand to the panelists and were commented on by two or three of them at a time.

The next parallel session consisted of three papers which revolved around the theme of procedures for testing communicative competence. The first paper was entitled "Research-Based Evaluative Measures of Communicative Competence" by Carolina A. Rionda (Philippines); the second, "Comparing Modes of Instruction Used in Learning to Listen to and Understand English as a Second Language" by Carolyn R. Ortmeyer and Beth L. Goldstein (Hong Kong); and "Linguistics and Language Testing: Their Relevance to the Thai Scene" by Vinit Phinit-Akson (Thailand).

The fifth plenary session focused on Language Proficiency Testing. P.W.J. Nababan (Indonesia) started this session by reading a paper entitled "Construct Validity of Reading Comprehension Tests Used in Indonesia". The paper described the various types of reading comprehension test papers in his country, which were administered in two languages (Indonesian and English) against a backdrop of "constructs" that (teaching) materials were designed to teach. He expressed the view that the reader brought into the ready comprehension task his whole background not only linguistic, but also non-linguistic knowledge (e.g. sociocultural factors).

Achara Wangsotorn (Thailand) in "Self Assessment of Language Proficiency" explained that in individualized EFL programs, the students' ability to evaluate their own English proficiency was crucial. External evaluation of students' communicative skills was not sufficient. She then proceeded to describe a research project in which the tests of the students' self-rating and tutor's rating and examination scores were being analyzed to establish correlation relationships. The project will then continue to investigate the difference between the two groups' precision in self-assessment by using the t-test.

Finally, Randall L. Jones (USA) in "Scoring Procedures in Oral Language Proficiency Testing" pointed out that scorers could be trained to evaluate oral proficiency in a very accurate and objective way. However, they must be careful to observe certain cues, and then to match the speaker's performance against an absolute scale of oral proficiency. Moreover, in most cases, a checklist and rating scale were useful. Finally, the criteria for various oral tests could differ, depending on the purpose of the test.

A series of four papers were next read at the parallel session that followed. These papers covered various aspects of language proficiency testing. David R. Richards (RELC) presented a paper entitled "Problems in Eliciting Unmonitored Speech"; Irene Teoh Brosnahan and Janice Neuleib (USA) "The Cloze Test as a Measure of Writing Ability"; Michael Smithies (Papua New Guinea) "Evaluating Aural Comprehension"; and Phoon Mun Kwong (Singapore) "Measuring Functional Literacy Among Secondary One Pupils in Singapore."

A second set of three papers were read at the parallel session that followed, all of which continued to discuss various aspects of language proficiency testing. Harold S. Madsen (USA) spoke on "Selecting Appropriate Elicitation Techniques for Oral Proficiency Tests"; Robert Keith Johnson (Hong Kong) on "Questioning Some Assumptions About Cloze Testing"; and Graeme Withers (Australia) on "Testing Second Language Learners: AnAustralian Experience."

The sixth and final plenary session was on the theme Current Testing Practices and Problems. Alan D. Moller (UK) started the session by enumerating a range of issues in "Assessing Proficiency in English for Use in Further Study," and examining them with reference to test procedures developed in Europe, North America, India, including the new Cambridge/British Council English Language Testing Service Measures (1980). Mats Oskarsson (Sweden) in "Subjective and Objective Assessment of Foreign Language Performance," argued for more student-centered approaches to the evaluation of progress in foreign language learning, especially subjective self-assessment procedures. He then described a formalized and objective method of measuring the four language skills as against evaluation techniques which make use of impressionistic self-assessment tools.

Two parallel sessions followed with three papers read at each session. The topics were concerned with a number of testing procedures and the problems encountered in their employment. Donald E. Bott (Thailand) read a paper on "The Use of Popular Songs for Diagnostic Testing"; Kanda Thammongkol and M.A. Frankel (Thailand) on "The Role of Tests in a Self-Study Reading Course"; Elizabeth Wood (Malaysia) on "Teaching an Evaluating Academic Reading"; David E. Ingram (Australia) on "The Australian Second Language Proficiency Ratings"; and finally Richard B. Noss (RELC) on "Cloze Tests as Diagnostic Instruments."

The Proceedings of the seminar, which contains summaries of all the papers and the topics raised at the workshops and panel discussions, is now available at RELC. The Center will also publish a selected number of papers presented at the seminar in the RELC Anthology Series, which should be available by the summer of 1981. Details and information on other RELC publications are available from: Publications Officer, SEAMEO Regional Language Center, 30 Orange Grove Road, Singapore 1025, REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

Report On the Colchester Second Language Acquisition Workshop, University of Essex by Vivian Cook (University of Essex)

This workshop, held June 6-8, 1980, was intended as an informal session for a small group of interested people, all of who would present informally some aspect of their current interests and research. Thus the emphasis was communicating with fellow-specialists in an informal atmosphere. For this reason it would be unfair to give full accounts of the papers that were discussed since the emphasis was not on a polished paper ready for publication. The following papers were given:

Ramsay Rutherford	(University of Bielefeld) "Acquiring Politeness and the Inner Game of Tennis" (discussion of what it means to be polite in a second language).
Clive Perdue	(University of Vincennes) "Spanish-speaking Immigrants Learning French" (account of the piloting of interview techniques for a larger project).
Eric Kellerman	(University of Nicaragua) "An Eye for an Eye" (markedness constraints in lexical transfer).
Vivian Cook	(University of Essex) "Functions in L2 Learning: Problems and Prospects."
John Roberts	(University of Essex) "A Flick through Valency" (uses of valency grammar for the pedagogic grammar of German).
Mike Sharwood Smith	(University of Utrecht) "Consciousness Raising and the L2 Learner"; relating acquisition theory to teaching methodology."
Bill Littlewood	(University College of Swansea) "Language Variation and L2 AcquisitionTheory."
Barry McLaughlin	(University of California at Santa Cruz) "Why Can't Manuel Learn To Read?"

The participants found the occasion useful and as organizer I was pleasantly surprised by the high level of discussion. Plans are afoot for a COLESLAW II in 1981 on much the same format.

The Japan Association of Language Teachers (JALT) Report On 1980 Summer Conference, by Yoshiko Takahashi (Stanford University)

Several interesting workshops were held at JALT conferences in various parts of Japan this summer. The topics showed a wide variety

ranging from the discussion of classroom procedures to the demonstration of new (still new in Japan) teaching methods such as Total Physical Response, Silent Way, Suggestopedia, etc. Among those which gave a lot of useful and interesting ideas to our TEFL classrooms was Judy Winn-Bell Olsen's Dyads demonstration. Ms. Judy Winn-Bell Olsen, a teacher of Alemany Community College and the author of Communication Starters (the Alemany Press, San Francisco, 1977) travelled widely in Japan and conducted presentations of Dyads.

According to Ms. Olsen the original examples of Dyad speech activities were seen in Dycom (Dyadic Communication), which was designed for native and near-native speakers of standard and non-standard English in Hawaii by Speech Communication people in the University of Hawaii in 1973.

The Dyads activities are exercises and games for pairs of students. The main difference between ordinary pair practice and the Dyads activities is in the fact that in the Dyads exercise one partner (or sometimes both partners) has information unknown to the other, and hence to complete the exercises successfully it becomes indispensable for the student to listen to what his partner says carefully, as well as to give as much accurate information as possible to his partner—hence, there involved the dynamics of real communication (the information is comprehended, processed in the student's mind and acted upon based on the information.) The purpose of the Dyads activities are, in short; 1) to establish real communication in the classroom; 2) to help students pay close attention to the classroom activities; and the most important is to build the student's communicative competence.

The Dyads techniques are utilized to teach almost everything—word intelligibility, sentence processing, grammar, and even speech acts. As for errors, mistakes made during exercises are not checked since Dyads theoretically supports the idea that all the errors which occur during learning process are developmental and all those who learn a language (or languages) whether as their L1 or L2 pass through the similar stages of imperfection. Talking about the language is also encouraged in soliciting information, comparing the ideas, and in defending choices—since in doing so the student uses more English and thinks about English consciously. In short, the use of Dyads to maximize communication in any form is encouraged.

Comments: After attending the workshops on Dyads the writer found a couple of worries in using the activities in our classrooms (having students with homogeneous mother tongue background): 1) How to prevent students from dropping into mother tongue talk to communicate to each other when they failed or found it difficult to convey or get the information; 2) from the cultural aspect, Japanese consider it a virtue to

read a person's mind (what the other thinks) before it is verbalized, hence students might not need to finish the utterances to get across the meaning; and 3) students might develop a specific Interlanguage with some characteristics of Japanese especially when the teacher is also Japanese (from my own experience.)

In the above although I expressed some concerns in using Dyads in Japan, I thoroughly enjoyed Ms. Olsen's active presentation and get useful ideas from it. As Ms. Olsen says, we can develop our own Dyadic exercises adapting to our situation. By creating and giving students the maximum chance of communication we hope our students will develop their communicative competence.

Report On The Japan Association of Language Teachers (JALT) International Conference On Language Teaching/Learning

The Japan Association of Language Teachers (JALT) sponsored the JALT International Conference on Language Teaching/Learning—1980, November 22-24 at Nanzan Junior College, Nagoya. Over 700 participants attended the conference which featured James Alatis (Georgetown U.), Joan Morley (U. of Michigan), Gertrude Moskowitz (Temple U.), and Jack Richards (Chinese U., Hong Kong).

There were over 80 presentations in the form of papers, workshops, and demonstrations, on relevant topics related to second language acquisition during the three days.

Report On The Symposium On Linguistic Problems Of Minority Groups and The Sociology Of Literature by Guus Extra (Institute of Applied Linguistics, Catholic University, Nijmegen)

This symposium, which took place September 18-19, 1980 at the Katholieke Hogeschool, Tilburg, surveyed research and practice in different European countries. Among the speakers were Verity Saifullah Khan (Linguistics Minority Project, London) who gave an overview of the development and philosophy behind minority linguistic issues in Britain. After outlining issues, existing projects, and particular practical problems, she discussed the Linguistics Minority Project, relating it to Britain and other European countries, and the relationship between theory, practice, and policy. Wolfgang Klein (Max Planck-Institut fur Psycholinguistik, Nijmegen) presented some results of a case study on a Spanish worker of the Heidelberger Forschungs-projekt "Pidgin Deutsch," whose competence in German after five years of stay was still very reduced, but whose verbal skills in general were highly developed. Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (University of Roskilde, Denmark) gave an overview of the development

and present situation in the education of minority groups in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. Rene Appel (General Linguistics, University of Amsterdam) discussed the very different situations of four linguistic minority groups in Holland (Frisians, Moluccans, Surinams, and Foreign Workers). He gave an overview of Dutch research in this field and suggested that linguistic research on minority groups would give more useful results if it were "research on the skin of the education system."

Following the presentations listed above, a forum-discussion on language and minorities was led by Simon Dik (General Linguistics, University of Amsterdam). The specific topics of the forum-discussion were 1) Language, Culture, and Socio-political Situation; 2) Home Culture vs. Host Culture; L1 vs. L2; 3) Linguistic Research and its (Lack of) Practical Applicability; and 4) How To Teach L2 Learners and How To Teach L2 Teachers: Who Teaches the Teacher?

In addition to the four speakers listed above, participants in the forum-discussion were: Henri Dors (Advice and Counseling Centre, Amsterdam), Elise van der Erve (Language Team Dutch Centre Foreigners, Utrecht), Roland Hurioglu (HTIB, Turkish Worker's Union in Holland), Charles Kalkhoven (School Counceling Service, Tilburg) , Marie-Louise Kemperman (Institution Welfare Foreign Workers, Tilburg), and Jantine Kriens (Institution for Turkish Adolescents, Amsterdam.)

Report On The Fifth Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development

The Fifth Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development was held on October 10-12, 1980, at the George Sherman Union in Boston. The conference began on Friday evening with a keynote address by Dr. Norman Geschwind, the James Jackson Putnam Professor of Neurology at Harvard University, Boston. His address was entitled, "Language and the Brain."

There were three general areas discussed in sessions on Saturday morning: Language Development in Young Children; Reading/Writing, chaired by Maurice Kaufman (Northeastern University); Language Disorders.

Saturday afternoon topics focused on: Sociolinguistic Interaction; Syntax/Semantics, chaired by Peter Salus; Bilingualism/Second Language Acquisition chaired by Maria Brisk (Boston University).

Papers presented during the sessions on Bilingualism/Second Language Acquisition included the following:

Fred Genessee (McGill University) "The Social Psychological Significance of Code Switching for Children"

Amy A. Strage (University of California, Berkeley) "Communicative and Analytic Strategies in Naturalistic Second Language Acquisition"

Kenji Hakuta (Yale University), Herlinda Cancino (The Huron Institute) Deborah Fish (Harvard University), and Maria Josefina Yanguas (Harvard University) "The Relationship Between Social, Linguistic and Cognitive Variables in Adult Second Lanuage Learning"

Rajendra Singh (University of Montreal) "Syllables in Interphonology"

Lloyd B. Anderson, "Different Paths of Language Development Among Deaf Students"

Manuel Escamilla and Kathy Cogburn-Escamilla (California State University, Fullerton) "A Comparison of English and Spanish Syntactic Language Development in Young Spanish Speaking Mexican-Americans in Maintenance Bilingual-Bicultural and Pull-Out ESL Programs"

There were concurrent sessions on Sunday morning dealing with Language Delay/Disorders; Cross-Linguistic Studies, chaired by Bruce Fraser, Boston University; and Selected Papers in Language Acquisition. Included in the sessions of Selected Papers in Language Acquisition were:

Madeline Boskey and Katherine Nelson (City University of New York) "Answering Unanswerable Questions: The Role of Imitation"

John L. Locke (Institute of Child Behavior and Development) "Phonetic Dispositions of the Child and Phonemic Demands of the Lexicon: Some Developmental Implications"

Carol L. Smith and Helen Tager-Flusberg (University of Massachusetts-Boston) "The Relationship Between Language Comprehension and the Development of Meta-linguistic Awareness"

Catherine Garvey and Valerin Greaud (The Johns Hopkins University) "Factors Influencing the Form of Contained Reference in Children's Talk"

Tsvia Walden (Harvard University) "Strategies Used by Preschoolers in Handling Ungrammatical Forms in Hebrew"

The conference concluded Sunday afternoon with three special sessions:

First Language Acquisition featuring Katherine Nelson (City University of New York) "The Significance of Individual Differences in First Language Acquisition"

Reading featuring Richard Venezky (University of Delaware) "Orthographic Structure and Letter Sound Relations in Word Recognition"

Second Language Acquisition featuring John Schumann ((University of California, Los Angeles) "Acquiring English as a Second Language and the Pidginization Hypothesis"

UPCOMING CONFERENCES

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) will hold its 15th Annual Conference March 3-8, 1981 at the Renaissance Center, Detroit, Michigan. The Conference will feature papers, workshops, demonstrations, and discussions in the following areas: Teaching English Abroad, ESL in the Elementary Schools, ESL in Higher Education, ESL in Secondary Schools, ESL in Adult Education, Standard English as a Second Dialect, ESL in Bilingual Education, EFL for Foreign Students in English Speaking Countries, and Applied Linguistics. For further information, contact: TESOL Central Office, 202 D.C. Transit Building, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20057, USA.

IXth Conference on Applied Linguistics: The English Language Institute of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan will host the IXth Conference on Applied Linguistics March 1 and 2, 1981. The theme of the conference will be Language Transfer in Language Learning. Invited speakers include S. Pit Corder, University of Edinburgh; Deborah Keller-Cohen, University of Michigan; Eric Kellerman, University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands; and Stephen Krashen, University of Southern California. Papers on all aspects of language transfer will be presented but a special focus will be on language transfer situations where English is not one of the languages involved. For further information, contact: Susan Gass, English Language Institute, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA.

California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL) State Conference will be held at the Monterey, California Convention Center, April 3-5, 1981. For further information, contact: Sharon Miller, Program Chairperson, c/o Donna Gomez, Hartnell College, 156 Homestead Avenue, Salinas, CA 93901, USA.

RELC Regional Seminar: The Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO) Regional Language Center(RELC) will hold its 16th Regional Seminar, April 20-24, 1981, in Singapore. The theme of the seminar is "Varieties of English and Their Implications For English Language Teaching in Southeast Asia."

The objectives of the seminar are:

To review the status and function of new varieties of English, with particular reference to Southeast Asia;

To assess the significance of psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic and pedagogic variables in relation to new varieties of English;

To review research findings in this area and to establish priorities for research;

To consider goals, methods and resources for language teaching in settings where local varieties of English exist;

To assess the effects of new varieties of English in Southeast Asian countries where English is neither first nor second language.

Abstracts are invited on topics relevant to the theme of the seminar. Further information and invitations to participate in the seminar can be obtained from the following address: Director, (Attention: Chairman Seminar Planning Committee) SEAMEO Regional Language Center, RELC Building, 30 Orange Grove Road, Singapore 1025, Republic of Singapore.

Symposium on Research in Child Language Disorders: The University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Communicative Disorders, and University of Wisconsin-Extension, Communication Programs will sponsor a Symposium on Research in Child Language Disorders June 12 and 13, 1981 in Madison, Wisconsin. Papers dealing with theoretical and applied research on language disorders in children are being solicited. Topics related to syntactic, semantic, phonological, and pragmatic performance in disordered populations will be considered for this symposium. Only research which has been completed and which has not been previously presented or published will be considered. Summaries and abstracts must be submitted no later than February 15, 1981. For further information and guidelines for submitting summaries and abstracts, contact: Symposium on Research in Child Language Disorders, c/o Jon Miller, Department of Communicative Disorders, UW-Madison, 1975 Willow Drive, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA

A Summer Institute For Haitian Creole Bilingual Teachers will be held at Indiana University June 21-August 14, 1981. Organized under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs (OBEMLA), the Institute is intended for present and prospective teachers in bilingual programs addressed to children speaking French and Haitian Creole in U.S. schools. The 1981 Summer Institute will be composed of two parts: 1) a 5-week component held on the Bloomington campus of Indiana University involving coursework, workshops, and a lecture series; and 2) a 3-week component involving micro-teaching in special bilingual classes at P.S. 189 in Brooklyn, New York. Twenty-four fellowships will be offered. Deadline for receipt of completed applications is March 15, 1981. For applications and information contact: Creole Institute, Ballantine Hall, Room 602, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405, USA

The Thirteenth Annual Stanford Child Language Research Forum (SCLRF) will take place April 24-26, 1981, at Stanford University. The keynote address will be delivered by Melissa Bowerman of the University of Kansas. Special interest groups will be conducted on: acquisition of speech registers (Elaine S. Andersen); ASL and gestural representation (Elissa Newport, Ted Supalla, and Susan Goldin-Meadow); and bilingualism in preschool children (Barry McLaughlin and Marilyn May Vihman). Deadlines for the conference are as follows: abstracts for Forum papers, January 10; resumes of current research, February 1; preregistration, March 20. For more information, contact Eve V. Clark and Megumi Kameyama, Coordinators, SCLRF-1981, Department of Linguistics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, U.S.A.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Courses and Programs

The Institute of English Language Education at the University of Lancaster announces two new programs:

1. ESP Teacher Training Courses

The IELE offers an intensive advanced training course for teachers of English for Specific Purposes (ESP), particularly, but not exclusively, in the areas of Technical, Scientific, and Vocational English.

This advanced course provides in-service training for ESP teachers or teacher trainers who wish to improve their professional effectiveness, up-date their knowledge, or learn more about recent developments and current thinking in the area of ESP.

Participants will be experienced teachers working in relevant areas of ESP from a variety of countries, but with a broadly similar background of work.

AIMS:

- to develop teachers' professional pedagogic knowledge in the area of English for Specific Purposes
- to develop an understanding of recent theoretical and practical advances in ESP as applied to specific language education
- to consolidate teachers' expertise, to enable them to work independently and confidently in their home institution, and to play a major role in the dissemination of knowledge and the improvement of local practice

CONTENTS:

The course focuses upon a communicative approach to the teaching of English for Specific Purposes and deals with a variety of topics in the areas of teaching the language or communication of a technical subject and learning language as a communicative activity, covering topics such as:

- discourse analysis
- curriculum and syllabus design
- needs analysis
- materials adaptation and development
- the relevance of a communicative approach to the teaching of ESP
- evaluation of materials and methods
- classroom management
- student evaluation
- learning and teaching in a communicative syllabus

2. Testing and Evaluation Consultancy

The IELE has established a Testing and Evaluation Consultancy which will advise user organizations on their testing and evaluation needs and act as a consultancy agency for the analysis of evaluation frameworks and procedures.

The Testing and Evaluation Consultancy of the Institute for English Language Education offers guidance and advice to user organizations, rather than a ready-made multi-purpose test. The TEC might typically be asked to assess the testing needs of an organization, to examine existing instruments against their stated purposes and against the aims of the organization, to look at the uses to which the instruments are put, to evaluate their usefulness and to make recommendations as to their improvement, replacement or creation. The TEC can also produce an assessment instrument for a given need, including research, construction, piloting, validation, and where necessary, norming.

The Testing and Evaluation Consultancy, with the support of the IELE, is available to advise on or carry out the evaluation of a language teaching curriculum. Such assessment might apply equally well to the evaluation of a particular textbook, syllabus, or method.

AIMS:

- to provide advice on testing needs and problems
- to advise on the evaluation of curricula, textbooks, and methods
- to offer guidance in the assessment of language achievement and language proficiency

— to help in the diagnosis of learning and teaching problems
— to assist with the placement of students or the selection of personnel
— to construct or help to construct appropriate language evaluation instruments
— to train personnel in construction, administration, and interpretation or evaluation procedures

For further information on either program, contact: The Secretary, Institute for English Language Education, Bowland College, University of Lancaster, LA1 4YT, England.

Publications

As a step toward the integration of European research devoted to the psychology of language (or psycholinguistics), the European Association for Psycholinguistics has been created. On November 6, 1978, Dr. John C. Marshall (University of Nijmegen), Dr. Jacques Mehler (Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Science Sociales, Paris), and Professor Willem J.M. Levelt (Max-Planck Gesellschaft, Nijmegen) met with representatives of various countries that are active in psycholinguistic inquiry. This meeting, held under the auspices of the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme and with the help of Dr. C. Heller, was attended by Dr. J. Allwood (University of Goteborg), Dr. F. Antinucci (University of Rome), Professor P. Berteson (University of Brussels), Dr. A. Karmiloff-Smith (University of Geneva), Professor P. Johnson-Laird (University of Sussex), Dr. J. Morton (Medical Research Council, Cambridge) and Professor K. Scherer (University of Giessen). A small committee, consisting of Dr. Marshal (secretary) and Susana Franck and Ursula de Pagter (executive coordinators) was set up with the aim of fostering contacts between people working in the various European countries.

As a first step towards the full exchange of research information and the creation of conditions in which mutually profitable research programs can be conducted across national boundaries, it was decided that a series of workshops on topics of common concern would be organized and that an informal newsletter would be published. The newsletter solicits contributions in the following areas: brief accounts of work in progress, announcements of conferences and/or symposiums, schedules of visiting researchers (either on sabbaticals or brief visits), announcements of up-coming monographs or books by European authors, and job advertisements—both for positions for psycholoinguists that become available and vice-versa.

Correspondence regarding the newsletter should be addressed to: Dr. John C. Marshall, Interfakultaire Werkgroep Taalen Spraakgedrag, University of Nijmegen, Berg en Dalseweg 119, 6522 BW Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

California Linguistic Newsletter (California State University, Fresno) Vol. XI, No. 6, Summer 1980; Vol. XII, No. 1, September 1980.

The Carrier Pidgin (University of Hawaii) Vol.VIII, No. 2, June 1980; Vol. VIIII, No. 3, September 1980.

Cizi Jazyky ve Skole (Foreign Languages, Prague) Vol. XXIII, Nos. 7-10, 1979-1980.

Collected Reviews (From the Language Institute of Japan Workshop for Japanese Teachers) Summer 1979.

Cross Currents: Communications/Language/Cross-Cultural Skills (The Language Institute of Japan) Vol. VII, No.1, 1980.

English Around The World (The English-Speaking Union of the United States) No. 22, May 1980.

Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics, Vol. IV, No.1, January 1978.

Interimsprachen-und Fehleranalyse. Teilkommentierte Bibliographie zur Zweitspracherwerbsjorschung 1967-1978 (Teil 2) (by Ingeborg Gutfleisch, Bert-Olaf Rieck, and Norbert Dittmar).

International Journal of Psycholinguistics, Vol. 12, No 5-4, 1978; Vol. 13, No. 6-1, 1979; Vol. 14, No. 6-2,1979.

JALT Newsletter (The Japan Association of Language Teachers) Vol. III, No. 1, January 1979; Vol. IV, No. 7, July 1980.

Language Planning Newsletter (East-West Culture Learning Institute) Vol. 6, Nos. 1-3, 1980.

Personality Differences Manifested By Bilinguals in Projective Materials Presented in Alternative Linguistic Contexts (Takeyoshi Nabekura).

SPEAQ Journal (Quebec) Vol. 3, Nos. 3 and 4, 1979.

A Study of Application of Trans-Formational Generative Grammar To Japanese Junior High School English Teaching, Master's Thesis, University of Kansas, 1973 (Kenji Kitao).

The Teaching Of American Culture In English Courses In Japan, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Kansas, 1976 (Kenji Kitao).

TEAL Occasional Papers (Teachers of English as an Additional Language) Vol. 4, 1980.

TEAM (Teachers of English: Arabian Monthly, Saudi Arabia) April 1980.

TESL Talk (Ontario Ministry of Culture and Recreation) Vol. 11, Nos. 1 and 2, Spring 1980.

RESUMES OF RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

Remember to send in your resumes of research in progress in order to share your work and ideas with other SLANT readers. Resumes should be approximately 200 words in length and should include a brief description of subjects, data collection procedures, data analysis, and languages involved. Deadline for inclusion in the Spring issue is March 1, 1981. Send to: Research Resumes, SLANT Newletter, English Department c/o Graham Wilson, San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA 94132, USA.

Aptitude Treatment Interaction in Silent Way and Suggestopedia
W. Knibbeler (Department of Applied Linguistics, Catholic University, University of Nijmegen, Erasmuslaan 40, 6500 HD Nijmegen, The Netherlands)

New approaches have been introduced in foreign language teaching during the last two decades. The approaches which deviate most from current teaching procedures are the Silent Way and Suggestopedia. Most research on Suggestopedia does not meet the demands of empirical research. Very little research has been done on Silent Way. An appropriate way to do research on both methods is to combine the method adopted in experimental psychology with the method adopted in correlational psychology. This enables us not only to examine the hypothesis that the student's response to instruction is conditioned by the suitability of the instruction to his/her personality, but also to define more precisely what are the dominant components of the Silent Way and Suggestopedia.

The Department of Applied Linguistics of the Catholic University of Nijmegen is planning a research project in order to find out whether variance in learners' characteristics correlates with difference in outcomes in the Silent Way and Suggestopedia respectively and whether similarity in learners' characteristics is a function of variance in outcomes in the Silent Way and Suggestopedia. By outcomes is meant scores on an achievement test, on a test of self-assessment of language proficiency and a test of affective response to the teaching experienced. By learners, characteristics is meant those personality traits, cognitive styles and learning styles which fit in with the distinctive characteristics of each method. There are fundamental differences between the Silent Way and Suggestopedia.

In order to collect the data needed for a multivariate analysis, we plan 12 French courses of 10 weeks and 40 hours for adults in continuing education, i.e., three Silent Way courses for advanced learners, three

Suggestopedia courses for advanced learners, three Silent Way courses for beginners, three Suggestopedia courses for beginners.

The courses will be given from January 1981 to June 1981. We expect 15 students to take part in each course. They will be selected on the basis of an entry test. Among the 180 participants we hope to find enough students possessing (some of) the learners' characteristics under investigations.

The classes will be given by six teachers. Each of them will give one Silent Way course and one Suggestopedia course. An observation instrument will be used in order to control personal characteristics of each teacher.

Processing of Verb Forms in Spoken Language A.J.A. Meijers (Language Center, Tilburg University, P.B. 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, Holland)

In the comprehension of spoken language, verbs play a very important part. Hence it is imperative for research on listening comprehension in a foreign language to find out what problems the FL student has with the processing of verb forms. Since a research instrument was not yet available, an experiment was carried out with processing verb forms in the mother tongue. The most important questions were: are stem and affix processed independently, are there any differences with different types of verbs (strong or weak), and is the processing linear or holistic.

Subjects were given pairs of verb forms and then had to decide whether stem and verb tense were the same by pressing a button which stopped an R T counter. The analysis of the results seemed to show that stem decision was faster than tense decision, that type of verb (strong and weak) only had an effect in tense decisions and that there were no clear arguments to be found either for linear or for holistic processing. These analyses were based on two reaction time measurements, one from the onset of the second verb form, the second from the end. Neither measurement seemed to be satisfactory.

A reinterpretation in which allowance was made in the reaction time measurement for the place in the word where the critical information lies for the processing of stem and tense (e.g. in "gespeeld" tense information lies in the beginning, in "speelde" at the end) showed that:

1. Stem decision always precedes time decision (even in cases where critical information for time precedes stem information.

2. Stem decisions are always faster than time decisions.

3. Stem decisions are made in accordance with the cohort-strategy developed by Marslen-Wilsen. This strategy provides for a partially simultaneous multi-level (phonological, syntactic and semantic) access to the lexicon, in which the processing of the two or three first phohemes of a word play a crucial role.

4. Type of verb (strong and weak) only affects tense decisions.

The findings of this experiment will be applied to the processing of verb forms in a foreign language, in our case French. The first experience will focus on the following questions:

1. What is the influence of "liaison" on verb recognition? (liaison may break down the phonological shape at the beginning of a verb form).

2. Does a stress shift from stem to suffix influence the processing? (this phenomenon does not exist in Dutch).

3. Do cognates facilitate the processing?

Whorfian Hypothesis Takeyoshi Nabekura (7-49-13 go, Higashi Oizumi-cho Nerima-ku, Tokyo 177 Japan)

The Whorfian hypothesis suggests that a language provides its speakers to perceive the world in unique and fixed patterns, and to behave accordingly. I will attempt to explore this hypothesis in a specific milieu. By doing so, I hope to delineate an area of research and clarification within the sprawling boundaries of the Whorfian hypothesis. What is postulated is a difference of kind, not a difference in degree, among the psychological structure of a bilingual person equally competent in English and Japanese. The specific questions to be explored in this study are as follows: 1) Does each language in a bilingual person induce a unique way of experiencing frustrating events and of interpreting them? 2) Do differences in choice of language form reflect differences in cultural adaptation to frustration? The Rosenzweig Picture Frustration (P-F) Study will be used for testing these questions. The P-F Study is prepared in English and Japanese. If language really presents the patterns of unconscious thought, the subjects' responses should be different when speaking different languages.

SUBSCRIPTION POLICY AND RENEWAL INFORMATION

It is once again time to send in your subscription renewals. A renewal card has been enclosed in this issue for your convenience. Please renew before March 31,1981 in order to avoid an additional 50¢ special handling charge. We can mail only issues that are prepaid, in U.S. currency. If you need an invoice, please request one and we will send it to you.

After six years of producing SLANT at phenomenally low prices, we find it necessary to raise our subscription rates for 1981. This increase reflects not only rising printing and mailing costs and cutbacks in institutional financial support, but a continued increase in volume and scope of the newsletter itself. Our 1981 subscription rates are as follows:

Individual:	$8 North America $10 Elsewhere	**Institutional:**	$10 North America $12 Elsewhere

Some of you have previously overpaid your subscriptions for one reason or another. Any credit to your account is now indicated on your mailing label. If you have a credit, subtract it from the 1981 rates for your 1981 renewal price.

We wish to thank you for your continued support over the years. Your letters of encouragement and positive comments have been greatly appreciated. We feel that you recognize the value of SLANT, and we will endeavor to maintain the high level of quality that you have come to expect from us.

BACK ISSUE ORDER INFORMATION AND TABLE OF CONTENTS

Back issues are now available through ERIC in the following format:

Issues 1-5 (inclusive)	ED 181 747
Issues 6-7 (inclusive)	ED 181 748
Vol. VIII, No. 1	ED 181 749
Vol. VIII, No. 2	ED 181 750
Vol. IX, No. 1	ED 181 751
Vol. IX, No. 2	ED 181 811

Both hard copy and microfiche are available from: ERIC Reproduction Services, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210.

In addition, we at SLANT will continue to provide individual back issues as a convenience to our readers at the following rates:

Issues 1-6

Individual:	$2.00 ea. North America $3.00 ea. Elsewhere	**Institutional:**	$3.00 ea. North America $4.00 ea Elsewhere

Issue 7—Vol.X, No.1

Individual:	$4.50 ea. North America $5.50 ea. Elsewhere	**Institutional:**	$5.50 ea. North America $6.50 ea. Elsewhere

The following Table of Contents provides more detailed information regarding the back issues:

Issue 1 (June, 1974)	**Prepared by:**	Larry Selinker
Issue 2 (Oct., 1974)	**Prepared by:**	Nancy Backman
	Research Report:	**New England**
	Conference Report:	LSA Summer Meeting
	Selinker's Bibliography	
Issue 3 (Aug., 1975)	**British Edition**	(Guest Editor: Richard Allwright)
	Conference Reports:	GURT Michigan Conference 2nd Int'l Conference of ATESOL (Dublin)
Issue 4 (Sept., 1975)	**West Coast Issue**	(Guest Editor: Abby Sher)
	Conference Report:	LA TESOL Convention
Issue 5 (Nov., 1976)	**Midwestern Edition**	(Guest Editor: Kyle Perkins)
	Conference Reports:	LSA Bilingual Symposium University of Louisville Conference Boston University Conference
Issue 6 (July, 1977)	**LA L2 Research Forum Issue**	(Guest Editors: Sabrina Peck and Judy Wagner-Gough)
Issue 7 (Nov., 1977)	**Research Report:**	**France & Switzerland** (Guest Editors: Uli Frauenfelder and Rémy Porquier)
	Conference Reports:	**Miami TESOL Convention** (Guest Editor: Elaine Tarone) Boston University Conference LSA Summer Meeting and Institute
Vol. VIII, No.1 (May, 1978)	**Research Reports:**	**Benelux** (Guest Editors: Catherine Snow, Pieter Muysken, Irene Vogel) **W.Germany** (Guest Editor: Henning Wode)

	Conference Reports:	ACTFL/AATG (Ann Fathman) CEEA/NEEA (James Kohn) CATESOL (Caroline Vaughan) FIPLV (Judith Chun) SCLRF (Joel Katz)
Vol. VIII, No.2 (Dec., 1978)	**Research Reports:**	**Canada** (Guest Editor: Fred Genesee) **Middle East** (Guest Editor: Gregory James)
	Conference Reports:	TESOL (Jody Hacker) Israeli Conference (Andrew Cohen) ICAP Symposium (Lars Henric Ekstrand) World Congress of Sociology (Stig Eliasson) Boston University Conference (Kenji Hakuta) LA L2 Research Forum (Robin Scarcella and Sharon Bode) Scandinavian-German Symposium (Hartmut Haberland)
Vol.IX, No.1 (June, 1979)	**Research Report:**	**Immigrant Workers in W. Germany** (Guest Editor: Jürgen Meisel)
	Conference Reports:	NAFSA Workshop (Melissa Allen-Adams and Todd Hochstatter) SCLRF (Mary McGroarty) CATESOL (Sau-ling Wong) TESOL (Mary Kay Ryan)
Vol. IX, No.2 (Dec., 1979)	**Research Reports:**	**Sweden** (Guest Editor: Lars Henric Ekstrand) **China** (Guest Editor: Tom Scovel)
	Conference Reports:	Nordic Symposium on Interlanguage (Jack Richards) RELC Regional Seminar (Jack Richards) LSA Summer Institute and Meeting (James Kohn) TESOL Summer Institute and Meeting (Judy Olsen) Boston University Conference (Ellen Rintell) Delaware Symposium (Laura Heilenman) NEXA Program (Phyllis Kirson)
Vol. X, No.1	**Research Report:**	**Australia** (Guest Editor: Michael Clyne)

Conference Reports: Yugoslavia (Caroline Vaughan)
JALT (Susan Goshen)
LSA Winter Meeting
SCLRF (Pat Porter)
BLS (Judy Olsen)
TESOL (Stephen Gaies,
Joyce Freundlich, and
Adrian Palmer)
GURT (Jim Cummins)
LA L2 Research Forum
(Michael Long and Kathleen Bailey)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: Our thanks to the English Department at San Francisco State University for continued administrative assistance and to all the support staff who have helped out this past year with various aspects of the production and mailing of SLANT: Mary Draper, Beth Edwards, Andrea Kevech, Elizabeth Reyes, and Sau-ling Wong. We would also like to thank the office staff of the English Department of San Jose State University for their help in duplicating the last issue: Karen Burdick, Leslie Calandrino, and particularly Candice Gonzalez Whelton, who spent many hours at the Gestefax machine!

A special acknowledgment goes to Assistant Editor Karen O'Neill, who conducted the Indochinese Survey, compiled the results of the survey, and edited the special report for this issue.